















Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



RTheol  
W

# THE HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

BY

WILLIAM WALL, M.A.

VICAR OF SHOREHAM, KENT, AND OF MILTON NEXT GRAVESEND.

TOGETHER WITH

MR. GALE'S REFLECTIONS,

AND

DR. WALL'S DEFENCE.

---

EDITED BY

THE REV. HENRY COTTON, D.C.L.

LATE STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

---

OXFORD:

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCLXII.







REFLECTIONS  
ON  
MR. WALL'S HISTORY  
OF  
INFANT-BAPTISM.

---

IN SEVERAL LETTERS TO A FRIEND.

---

Teach me, and I will hold my tongue : and cause me to understand wherein I have erred.

How forcible are right words ! but what doth your arguing reprove ?

JOB vi. 24, 25.





## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THERE would have been no need to tell the reader that the following letters were written in the years 1705, 1706<sup>a</sup>; but that, there having been two editions of Mr. Wall's History<sup>b</sup>, he might see the reason why the first of these is made use of, and constantly referred to.

And as these letters were originally designed for the private perusal of a friend, so it is not to be thought strange that they were not published sooner, but rather that they are published at all; for the author, though he was urged to it pretty early, had no thought nor inclination, in the least, to have given the public this trouble. He hoped a more learned advocate would have been engaged in this controversy<sup>c</sup>; but it seems that gentleman did not think it necessary, since Mr. Wall had not pretended to reply to his 'Answer to Mr. Russen;' and had also been convinced by him in private conversation, that he was mistaken in charging him with a misrepresentation of a passage out of Dr. Allix's 'Remarks on the 'Ancient church of Piedmont,' which he promised to rectify together with some other inadvertencies, in his second edition.

It not being known therefore that a direct answer to Mr. Wall's book was designed by any other hand, the author's friends represented to him how much the pædobaptists on all occasions boasted of that supposed unanswerable performance, which has indeed been highly recommended and extolled by the most learned among them, and by some in print.

Mr. Reeves, speaking of the history of Pelagius, says, 'It is treated of by Dr. Forbes, Dupin, and especially by the learned Mr. Wall, in his excellent account of infant-baptism; which last I particularly recommend to the English reader<sup>d</sup>.'

<sup>a</sup> [Probably Mr. Gale ought to have added 1707: since, in the beginning of letter VI, he makes mention of the union with *Scotland as completed*, a transaction which did not take place till that year.]

<sup>b</sup> [The first edition appeared in 1705: the second, in 1707: the third, in 1720. Mr. Gale could not have seen this *last*, as his work was published in the year 1711.]

<sup>c</sup> [Mr. J. Stennet seems to be the person intended; his 'Answer to Russen' was published in 1704. The Bodleian Library contains a copy of it, formerly belonging to Dr. Wall, and filled with his MS. remarks, the substance of which appears to have been afterwards incorporated into his 'History.']

<sup>d</sup> Apologies, vol. ii. p. 357, note.

Dr. Stanhope, speaking of the pretended Jewish baptism, says, 'It is set in a very clear light by the late excellent labours of a worthy and learned divine,' referring to Mr. Wall of infant-baptism, in the margin.

And above all, the whole clergy in Convocation have in a particular manner approved and commended the book, in the following vote passed soon after the publication of it, to shew how very acceptable it was to them.

Feb. 9, 1705-6. 'Ordered, That the thanks of this House be given to Mr. Wall, vicar of Shoreham in Kent, for the learned and excellent book he hath lately written concerning infant-baptism; and that Dr. B. and Mr. R.<sup>f</sup> do acquaint him with the same.'

Nay, Dr. Atterbury, the reputed author of 'The Proceedings in the Convocation, A. D. 1705, faithfully represented,' says, 'The history of infant-baptism was a book for which the author deserved the thanks, not of the English clergy alone, but of *all Christian churches*.'

These things, together with the importunity of the author's friends, did at length prevail with him to suffer the publication of the following reflections: to inform the public, that the anabaptists, as they are called, notwithstanding the noise Mr. Wall's history has made, and the reputation it has gained, are still safe and untouched by him: and likewise to let these learned gentlemen know, that they have been much too hasty in their judgment, and that this history is not by far what they take it to be.

The Catalogue of Authors added at the end of these letters, was drawn up with a design to have set down what editions are made use of, in order to prevent any mistake that might otherwise happen; which is done with regard to the authors of greatest consequence in the dispute; but all the books could not be conveniently come at just when the last sheet was to be printed; and therefore the editions are not always noted, which the reader is desired to excuse. The author however promises to be answerable for all his citations, which are none of them taken at second-hand; and if any are sought for in one edition, and not found, they may be met with in another.

<sup>e</sup> Paraphrase, &c. on the Epistles, &c. vol. iv. p. 340.

<sup>f</sup> The two proctors for the diocese [of

Rochester, viz. Dr. Fr. Durant de Breval, and Mr. Samuel Rhodes].

\* Page 35. [4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1708.]

# CONTENTS.

---

## LETTER I.

HEATS among Christians inconsistent with their profession, and a great dishonour to Christianity, p. 2. This reflection occasioned by a letter the author received, very unbecoming the character of his friend that sent it, *ibid.* The author endeavours to find an excuse for his friend, p. 3. We are generally more subject to passion in matters of religion than in other things, *ibid.* His friend's great respect to the Church of England, which he thinks to be the best constituted national Church in the world, some sort of excuse for him, *ibid.* We have no infallible judge on earth, p. 4. Nothing can excuse unreasonable excesses of any kind, *ibid.* Hard names, &c. no real prejudice to our cause, *ibid.* Mr. Wall's moderation only pretended, p. 5. The antipædobaptists hearty friends to the present government, p. 6. They who make the greatest outcries of the church's danger, known to be her greatest enemies, *ibid.* Persecution for religion, directly contrary to our Saviour's doctrine and example, p. 7. Arguments from Scripture, the proper means to convince men, p. 8. The antipædobaptists open to instruction, *ibid.* Mr. Wall's History not so formidable as is pretended, *ibid.* He is not much to be depended on, p. 9. His real aim and design was only to establish the baptism of infants ; as appears by considering his pretence from Justin Martyr, p. 10. Another from St. Cyprian, p. 11. Another from the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 13. He takes all occasions to blacken the antipædobaptists ; disguising his designs with pretences to moderation, p. 14. This charge not inconsistent with charity, *ibid.* Learned men are best able to judge of matters, p. 15. Mr. Wall endeavours to possess his readers with an opinion of his learning, by several needless digressions : on the Decretal Epistles, *ibid.* On the history of Pelagianism, *ibid.* And in this, on the lawfulness of oaths and possessing of riches, p. 16. On the virginity of our Lord's mother, *ibid.* On the Socinians, and the Tritheism they charge on the Fathers, *ibid.* This a subject too difficult for Mr. Wall, p. 17. His ridiculous reflection on Mr. Stennet noted, p. 18. Another artifice to gain reputation, by quarrelling with several of the greatest men for learning, &c. *ibid.* : as



archbishop Tillotson, p. 18 ; Bishop Burnet, *ibid.* ; Rigaltius, p. 19 ; Gregory Nazianzen, father and son, *ibid.* ; St. Chrysostom, p. 20 ; Mr. Le Clerc, *ibid.* Difference in opinion no warrant to dispense with the rules of charity, p. 21. Moral virtues more acceptable to God than speculative notions, *ibid.* Mr. Le Clerc no Arian, Photinian, or Socinian, p. 22. Mr. Wall also quarrels with Grotius, p. 24. The sense of a passage in St. Gregory set right, which Mr. Wall had misrepresented, p. 26. The sense of a canon of the Neocæsarean council rescued from the force Mr. Wall put upon it, p. 27. As also the words of Zonaras and Balsamon in relation thereto, p. 28. St. Austin and Pelagius speak of the end, not of the subjects of baptism, p. 29. He that takes so much liberty with such men, will take more, in all probability, with the antipædobaptists, *ibid.* Mr. Wall has not acted the part of a faithful historian towards us, *ibid.* He several times, on no ground at all, takes for granted some things, merely because they favour his design, p. 30. And charges the antipædobaptists with whatever he has heard any one among them to have believed or said, *ibid.*

## LETTER II.

The private opinions of a few not justly inserted in the history of the whole body, p. 32. There are probably ill men among us, as well as among others, p. 33. Some of our author's invidious insinuations, p. 34. Our adversaries, instead of railing, should endeavour to convince us from revelation, or reason, or antiquity, *ibid.* If their reflections were true, our reputation cannot suffer much, p. 35. We are not guilty of the hated opinions Mr. Wall loads us with, *ibid.* Our separation easy to be justified, p. 36. Mr. Wall has not sufficiently shewn wherein the sin of schism consists, p. 37. He only explains it in general by division, separation, &c. *ibid.* The true notion of schism, *ibid.* It may either be lawful or unlawful, p. 38. Who are schismatics, *ibid.* Not they who go out from a communion they were before joined with, but they who unnecessarily give or take the occasion ; or continue separate without just cause, *ibid.* It being lawful in some cases, and unlawful in others to separate ; it is examined what will justify a separation, p. 39. Mr. Wall's distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, though good in itself, is insufficient, unless he had determined what are fundamentals, and what not, *ibid.* A rule to know these, *ibid.* Christ alone can determine what is necessary ; and what he has not expressly made so, is not so, p. 40. It is useful to distinguish between things necessary to salvation, and things only necessary to the constitution of a true Gospel church, *ibid.* This distinction well grounded, because the qualifications of a Christian and of a church are very different, *ibid.* An error in what is essential to the constitution of a church only, a sufficient warrant to separate from a community in such error, p. 42. Which is also confirmed from some of

Mr. Wall's own words, p. 42. Agreement in the fundamentals of religion, not a sufficient reason against separation, as Mr. Wall would urge it, *ibid.* Turned against himself, p. 44. Therefore his arguments tend to nothing so much as confusion, *ibid.* Though it should be allowed, that we ought to submit all things purely indifferent, to the determination of our superiors ; this would make but very little, if at all, in Mr. Wall's favour, p. 45. It does not follow, that persons who think they ought not to renounce communion for smaller matters, must therefore constantly conform in those things, and neglect what they think is better, p. 46. If the ceremonies are not of so much consequence, as to justify the dissenters in their separation ; neither will they justify the church in so unnecessarily insisting on them, p. 47. These things, said to be indifferent in themselves, by being the occasions of division, cease to be indifferent, and become unlawful, *ibid.* The dissenters are verily persuaded, the things for which they dissent are not so indifferent as they are pretended, p. 48. The Church's power of making laws for its own government, of no service to Mr. Wall, *ibid.* Things in themselves lawful may be so circumstantiated as to become unlawful, p. 49. As the case stands at present, the dissenters are obliged to dissent from the national Church, *ibid.* The uncharitable obstinacy of our adversaries, *ibid.* The separation of the antipædobaptists particularly defended, p. 50. Mr. Wall pretends, that though they are right, they have no ground to separate, p. 51. The antipædobaptists' notion stated, *ibid.* The time and manner of receiving baptism, so far as it relates to our present dispute, are fundamentals, *ibid.* That cannot be true baptism which differs from true baptism, p. 52. Our separation justified by the definition of a church, in the nineteenth article of the Church of England, p. 52, 53. We ought not to unite with persons unbaptized, p. 53. True baptism necessary to church membership, p. 54. The words of the institution, the best rule to judge what is true baptism, *ibid.* We refuse to communicate with the Church of England, for the same reason for which she refuses to communicate with persons unbaptized. p. 55. Mr. Wall's terms of union very partial and unreasonable, *ibid.* We are obliged to the Toleration for the general forbearance Mr. Wall boasts of, p. 55, 56. And desire to remain in the hands of her Majesty and parliament under God, who have hitherto so kindly secured us, p. 56. A fair proposal in order to establish unity among us, *ibid.* Mr. Wall a friend to persecutions for religion, *ibid.* The conclusion, p. 57.

### LETTER III.

Another instance of Mr. Wall's unfairness, p. 58. The dispute between the English pædobaptists and us cast under two heads, p. 59. It is strange, things so clear should be capable of so much dispute, *ibid.* So far as the Scriptures are clear, our practice is allowed to be exactly

agreeable therewith, p. 59. Therefore if we err, we are, however, on the safer side, p. 60. God has revealed his will with sufficient clearness in all material points, *ibid.* And he has not left it doubtful in what manner, or to what subjects, baptism should be administered, *ibid.* A frightful remark of Mr. Wall's noted, *ibid.* It is better not to pretend to baptize persons, than not to do it as Christ requires it should be done, p. 61. The Greek word for *baptize* always signifies *to dip* only into any manner of thing, *ibid.* So Lycophron, *ibid.* And Sophocles, p. 62. But more commonly it is used for dipping into liquids, *ibid.* So Homer, *ibid.* Metaphors include and borrow their beauties from the thing from whence they are taken, p. 63. Pindar and his Scholiast, p. 64. Euripides and his Scholiasts, p. 65. Aristophanes in many places, p. 66. The words in dispute frequently applied to the dyer's art, *ibid.* And they colour things by dipping them, *ibid.* Several passages wherein the word alludes to the art of dying, considered, p. 66, 67. The improper use of words in metaphorical passages cannot be supposed to alter their signification, p. 68. Figurative forms of speech are only abbreviated similes, p. 69. It is no objection to say, if words are always literally understood, authors will be made to speak nonsense, *ibid.* Figurative sentences not literally true, as they stand; but being defective, the sense must be supplied, p. 70. We should distinguish between the sense of a phrase, as it includes some words not expressed; and the sense of the particular words singly considered, just as they stand, *ibid.* Words have no more than one signification, p. 71. Words are always to be taken in their literal sense, *ibid.* The use of these observations in the present dispute, *ibid.* More instances from Aristophanes, p. 72. Πλύνω is to wash by dipping, p. 73. More instances from Aristotle, p. 74, 75. From Heraclides Ponticus, p. 76. From Herodotus, *ibid.* From Theocritus, p. 77. From Moschus, *ibid.* From Aratus, *ibid.* From Callimachus, p. 78. From Dionysius Halicarnassæus, p. 79. From Strabo, p. 80. From Plutarch, p. 81. From Lucian, *ibid.* From the emperor Marcus Antoninus, p. 82. The metaphorical use of the word in dispute, when applied to the mind, considered and explained, *ibid.* Other instances, from Pollux, p. 84. From Themistius, *ibid.* That lexicographers and critics render the word by *lavo*, is no argument they ever understood it to mean less than *to dip*, *ibid.*

#### LETTER IV.

Critics constantly affirm, the proper and genuine sense of βαπτίζω is *immergo*, &c. p. 86. So Vossius, Constantine, and Stephanus render it, *ibid.* A testimony from Casaubon, *ibid.* His poor evasion, p. 87. Another from Grotius, *ibid.* Another from Dionysius Petavius, *ibid.* It is needless to collect more, p. 88. Mr. Wall conscious, notwithstanding his pretence, that the opinions of learned men are against him, *ibid.* Whereas



Mr. Wall appeals to the Scriptures for the sense of the word, it is shewn largely to be never there used in his sense, but the contrary, p. 89. Levit. xiv. 6. considered. *ibid.* That the word does not always necessarily signify *to dip all over*, is the most that can be inferred from it, *ibid.* Besides, here it means to dip all over, p. 90. Isai. xxi. 4, Ezek. xxiii. 15, Dan. iv. 33, and v. 21, considered, p. 91, &c. Hot climates very dewy, p. 93. The Syriac version confirms our sense, *ibid.* Ecclus. xxxi. 26; 2 Macc. i. 21; Ecclus. xxiv. 26. considered, p. 94, &c. The purification enjoined for touching that which is dead, to be performed by sprinkling, p. 95. Together with dipping, *ibid.* The Mahometans purify in such cases by washing all over, p. 97. Washing was the main part of the purification among the Jews, *ibid.* For which reason the Son of Sirach uses this word to intend the whole ceremony, *ibid.* Luke xi. 38. considered, p. 99. Mr. Wall pretends the Jews always washed their hands, by having water poured on them, *ibid.* Which is false, p. 100. The priests washed their hands and feet by dipping them, p. 101. Our Lord washed his disciples' feet so likewise, *ibid.* The authority of the rabbins not to be depended on, p. 102. Dr. Pococke allows, the Jews were obliged sometimes to wash by dipping, p. 103. And from thence accounts for the use of the word βαπτίζεσθαι, Mark vii. 4. *ibid.* Mr. Wall's next instance, which is Mark vii. 4, considered, p. 104. They that came from the market did wash by dipping, p. 106. Sects among the Jews who washed themselves frequently, p. 107. The words may refer to the things brought from the market, p. 109. Heb. ix. 10. and Matt. xxvi. 23. considered, p. 110, &c. The sacramental washing being expressed by words which signify any kind of washing, does not prove it may therefore be administered by any kind of washing, p. 112, 113. Words, like our ideas, have their *genera* and *species*, p. 113. Words of a more particular sense should explain the more general, and not the contrary, p. 114.

## LETTER V.

To appeal to the Scriptures only for the sense of a word. very unreasonable, p. 116. It is notwithstanding proved from them, that the Greek word must always signify *to dip*, p. 117. What passages may be argued from, *ibid.* Luke xvi. 24. *ibid.* John xiii. 26. *ibid.* Rev. xix. 13. p. 118. The vulgar copies have lost the true reading in the last, *ibid.* Metaphorical passages make for, not against my opinion, p. 119. Languages do not exactly answer to one another, p. 120. If the word βαπτίζω were otherwise ever so ambiguous, yet as it relates to baptism, it is sufficiently determined only and necessarily to mean *to dip*, p. 121. By the doctrine and practice of St. John, *ibid.* Of the holy apostles, *ibid.* Of the succeeding church for many centuries, which urged a trine immersion, p. 124. Learned men in general allow this mode of baptism, p. 125. Mr. Wall pretends, though the ancients did generally baptize by *immersion*, they likewise used

*affusion*, or the like, p. 126. But this was not allowed in common cases *ibid.* Asperion, how at first admitted, p. 127. It is unreasonable to argue, that the general sense of a law is the same with the exceptions that are made to it, p. 128. The ancient church of the first centuries did not practise affusion, &c. p. 130. St. Cyprian's plea for asperion very trifling, p. 131. All who were baptized in the apostles' times were baptized by immersion, p. 133. The clinical affusions do not appear to have been introduced till about two hundred and fifty years after Christ, p. 134. At which time, they very much doubted of their validity, p. 135. By the first patrons granted to be presumptive, p. 136. All allow immersion was insisted on anciently as the only regular way, in all common cases at least, p. 138. A humble remark on the bishop of Salisbury's plea for changing the manner of administering the sacrament here in England, p. 140. The clergy pretend they would gladly revive the ancient practice, but do not take the proper methods; and in reality obstruct its being revived, p. 140. *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω* synonymous, p. 141.

## LETTER VI.

The other chief article in dispute between the baptists and their adversaries, p. 142. They continually repeat the most trifling objections, though they have been fairly answered over and over, p. 143. Which has made it necessary to say a great deal to what has been well enough answered already, and concerning things which are very plain of themselves, *ibid.* The late handling of this controversy has convinced the world, the baptists are not that unreasonable sect they were represented to be; and it is not to be doubted but the reviving the dispute at present may go far to open people's eyes yet much more in their favour, *ibid.* It is pity some friendly measures are not taken to compose the difference, which is not so impracticable as some fancy, *ibid.* Mr. Wall's attempt, though the best in its kind, falls very short of answering the design of it, *ibid.* His scheme, *ibid.* He first allows it cannot be made appear from Scripture, that infants are to be baptized, *ibid.* And therefore recurs to these as the only expedients: 1. To the practice of the Jewish church: 2. To the practice of the ancient Christians, p. 144. Some reflections which overturn all he says as to his main conclusion, though he should prove these two points ever so solidly, p. 145. From his concession, that it cannot be proved from Scripture, it unavoidably follows, that it is no institution of Christ, *ibid.* And to suppose it may be included in some of the more general expressions is only to beg the thing in dispute, p. 146. Unless he can shew us infant-baptism is so much as mentioned in Scripture, we shall not believe it is instituted there, p. 147. Our author makes the Scriptures the rule of language; which he therefore ought with much more reason to make the only rule of his faith and practice, *ibid.* The baptism of infants

is unlawful if Christ has not instituted it, p. 148. True protestants should adhere to the Scripture, as the only infallible guide in all religious controversies, p. 149. They who do otherwise, seem to be too near the church of Rome, as to the article of tradition at least, which is an inlet to all the rest, *ibid.* Our adversaries act very inconsistently in rejecting tradition, in their disputes with the Romanists, while they recur to it as their main refuge in the present dispute with us, *ibid.* That infant-baptism ought not to be practised, is proved from our author's principles, compared with the articles of the church, *ibid.* It gives the *Romanists* a handle to weaken the reformation with too much advantage, p. 150. The articles of the church directly against traditions. p. 151. The Scriptures' silence as good an argument against paedobaptism as can be desired, p. 152. We find a strong tendency in our minds to depend upon the Scriptures only, *ibid.* We are obliged by any sort of law, &c. only to the particulars the said law expresses, *ibid.* This illustrated by instances, and by an undoubted maxim from Tertullian, p. 153. Applied also to the present dispute, and illustrated by more instances, *ibid.* Some build the ecclesiastical hierarchy mainly on that very foundation on which the baptizing of infants is opposed, p. 154. Mr. Wall sometimes argues in the same manner as the baptists do against paedobaptism, p. 155. The objection, that Christ nowhere forbids us to baptize infants, answered, *ibid.* We are forbid to teach the traditions of men for commandments of God, p. 156. The paedobaptists' argument enervated by Tertullian, *ibid.* Though the Scripture's silence may sometimes, it does not always leave it so much as lawful to do what it does not mention, p. 157.

## LETTER VII.

That the Scripture does not leave infant-baptism so undetermined as some would pretend, is largely shewn from Matt. xxviii. 19, p. 160. All laws equally oblige in all particulars mentioned in them, *ibid.* This applied to our present dispute, p. 161. The commission necessarily obliges to teach all it intends should be baptized, *ibid.* Therefore infants cannot be included in that commission, *ibid.* The commission also requires, that all of whom it speaks should be first taught, and afterwards baptized, p. 163. The ridiculous objection of such as say, infants also are to be taught, answered, p. 164, 165. Some would evade its force, by confessing, this commission relates particularly to the adult, which is directly giving up the argument, p. 165. What the paedobaptists urge from the words *all nations*, answered, p. 166. It is not said *all of all nations*, *ibid.* Illustrated by a parallel instance from Matt. iii. 5, 6. *ibid.* Mr. Dorrington censured, p. 167. It is proved, the commission most directly excludes infants, p. 168. What the paedobaptists urge concerning the Greek word *μαθητεύσατε* answered, *ibid.* Dr. Hammond censured for so grossly contradicting



himself in this point, p. 168. Men of the greatest learning disown the criticism of the paedobaptists, p. 169. A passage from the bishop of Sarum, *ibid.* Another from Dr. Whitby, *ibid.* *Μαθητεύειν* is constantly used to signify nothing less than *to teach*, &c. p. 170. The sense of the word proved from its etymology, p. 171. The primitive, and all its derivatives, include *teaching*, &c. *ibid.* No room for an *antiphrasis*, which is now exploded by the best grammarians, *ibid.* The pretence from the termination, that words in *-εῖν* are to be interpreted by *sum* in Latin, is groundless, p. 172. Plutarch uses the word to signify *to teach*, p. 173. Another instance from St. Ignatius, p. 174. Another from the same, *ibid.* Another from the same, *ibid.* Some from St. Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 175. One from St. Justin Martyr, p. 176. The meaning of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, *ibid.* Another instance from St. Justin, p. 177. The word *μαθητεύειν*, even in its supposed neuter acceptance, notwithstanding the contrary pretences, always includes *teaching*, p. 178. Matt. xxvii. 57, considered, *ibid.* Instances wherein the word signifies *to teach*, &c. even when constructed with a dative case, from Plutarch, p. 179. From Origen, p. 180. From St. Irenæus, expounded by a passage of Socrates, and from Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 180. 181. The true sense of the word further illustrated by synonymous words, p. 181. Instances of *παιδέω* from Plutarch, *ibid.* From Ælian, *ibid.* From Plato, *ibid.* Instances of *ἀκούω*, from Pindar, p. 182. From Diogenes Laertius, *ibid.* From Plutarch, *ibid.* An instance of *διακούω* from Plutarch, p. 183. A very remarkable instance of the sense of *μαθητεύειν*, from Clemens Alexandrinus, *ibid.* Another from the same, p. 184. One from Origen, p. 185. Besides, if what our adversaries advance were right, it can be of no advantage to them, because the word in the commission is allowed to be transitive, p. 186. Discipleship necessarily includes teaching, *ibid.* *Μαθητεύω* means *to teach successfully*, and therefore is indeed consequentially *to make disciples*, *ibid.*

## LETTER VIII.

Dr. Hammond explains *μαθητεύσατε*, Matth. xxviii. 19. by John iv. 1. without, if not contrary to all reason, p. 188. His unfairness noted, *ibid.* A passage of the bishop of Sarum in favour of the antipaedobaptists' sense of the word, p. 189. Another from Mr. Le Clere, *ibid.* What Mr. Wall urges from the notion of a disciple, considered, p. 190. *Μαθητῆς* is only said of such as are at least capable of being taught, *ibid.* Mr. Wall's groundless and unfair attempt upon Acts xv. 10. to prove the contrary, examined, *ibid.* The words relate only to adult persons, p. 191. A disciple, in common discourse, ever signifies one that is taught, &c. *ibid.* So it does likewise among the Latin authors; from whom we borrow it. p. 192. Proved from the etymology of *discipulus*, *ibid.* By instances from Cicero, *ibid.* From Juvenal, *ibid.* From Terence, *ibid.* From

Cornel. Nepos, p. 192. All the world have had the same notion of a disciple, p. 193. Instances in the eastern languages, *ibid.* In the Anglo-Saxon, *ibid.* No instance that it is used otherwise in any Greek author, but many of the sense the antipædobaptists plead for, *ibid.* One taken from John ix. 27, *ibid.* One from Acts xviii. 23, *ibid.* Another from Dionysius Halicarnassæus, *ibid.* Illustrated also by synonymous words, *ibid.* Instances of ἀποστής, *ibid.* From Diogenes Laertius, *ibid.* From Plutarch, p. 194. An instance of ἀποσώμενος from Plutarch, *ibid.* Of ἀκουστής from Ælian, *ibid.* From Dionysius Halicarnassæus, *ibid.* This illustrated by instances from Roman authors, *ibid.* From Cicero, *ibid.* The inference from all this in the present dispute, p. 195. A passage from Lucian, wherein he explains the phrase *to make disciples*, *ibid.* *Disciple* and *teacher* used as correlates, p. 196. By Themistius, *ibid.* By Cicero, *ibid.* This applied to the present dispute, *ibid.* The most judicious have always allowed, that the word in the commission particularly signifies *to teach* and *instruct*, *ibid.* As Constantine, *ibid.* Stephens, p. 197. Leigh, *ibid.* Turretine, *ibid.* Episcopius, *ibid.* Limborch, p. 198. Cameron, *ibid.* Martin Bucer, *ibid.* Rigaltius, *ibid.* Erasmus, p. 199. Grotius, *ibid.* Lucas Brugensis, *ibid.* This proved to be the sense of the place from the several versions, p. 200. The Hebrew, *ibid.* Syriac, p. 201. Arabic, *ibid.* Persic, *ibid.* Ethiopic, *ibid.* Arias Montanus, *ibid.* Vulgar Latin, *ibid.* That of Sixtus V, *ibid.* Beza, *ibid.* Erasmus, p. 202. Castalio, *ibid.* The Italian, *ibid.* Spanish, *ibid.* French, *ibid.* Dutch, *ibid.* Danish, *ibid.* Saxon, *ibid.* Vulgar Greek, *ibid.* The Fathers of the primitive church always understood the word in the commission signified *to teach*, *ibid.* Thus Clemens Alexandrinus, *ibid.* Origen, *ibid.* St. Justin, p. 203. Eusebius, *ibid.* Apostolical Constitutions, p. 204. St. Clement, *ibid.* Epiphanius, *ibid.* St. Basil, *ibid.* Tertullian, *ibid.* Clarus, bishop of Mascula, p. 205. St. Hierome, *ibid.* Lastly, This is proved to be the true sense of the place by the authority of the sacred Scriptures themselves, p. 206. The practice of the apostles, *ibid.* Parallel places, *ibid.* The sum of the evidence, p. 207. From all it follows, that the commission obliges to teach all that are to be baptized; and therefore that the Scriptures are not so silent concerning the baptizing of infants as the pædobaptists would have us think, *ibid.* So that if Mr. Wall should prove the Jews and Christians did baptize their children, we have still reason enough not to admit the practice, *ibid.*

## LETTER IX.

Mr. Wall's attempt founded on mistake, p. 208. His pretences from the Jews examined; which he has collected from the learned men who best understood their writings, p. 209. Their authority of no weight; the reasons they go upon being too weak, *ibid.* It is without sufficient ground

that our author asserts, the Jews make it plain they baptized their proselytes before Christ's time, p. 209. His authorities too late, p. 210. Great alterations introduced in a short time, *ibid.* The passages produced by Mr. Wall do not so much as intimate that the Jews baptized proselytes in our Saviour's time, p. 211. There is no necessity to understand the words in Mr. Wall's sense, *ibid.* The Jews used to baptize for the pollution contracted in circumcision; which may be the baptism spoken of in the Talmud, p. 211, 212. Some of the rabbins plainly shew us they neither knew nor allowed of any initiatory baptism, 212. They ridicule our baptism as a fanciful ceremony, as appears from the ancient Nizzachon, which fixes the rise of the practice in Christ, and mentions it as an initiation peculiar to Christians; and opposes to it the Jewish circumcision only, *ibid.* It appears farther from Rab. Isaac, p. 213. So that the Jewish writings, if any thing, prove contrary to our author's opinion, p. 214. The authority of the rabbins very insignificant, and never to be depended on, *ibid.* Their writings in general stuffed with very foolish, romantic tales, p. 215. Their fabulous and ridiculous way of accounting for Christ's power of miracles, from Toldoth Jeschu, *ibid.* More instances of their ridiculous whimsies from the Talmud, p. 218. Their foolish misapplication of Scripture, p. 219. Their impious representations of God, *ibid.* A fabulous account of the origin of Rome, p. 220. Another concerning R. Eliezer, in confirmation of their traditions, p. 221. The Pirké of Eliezer, *ibid.* Another reason why the rabbins are not to be relied on is, that they profess to follow their doctors in all they assert, though ever so absurd, *ibid.* They prefer their Talmud and traditions before the Scriptures themselves, p. 222. The character of the rabbins, *ibid.* Their excessive pride, *ibid.* Their way of interpreting the Scriptures, p. 223. The Sanhedrim, though made up of their best men, consisted only of magicians, as themselves assert, &c. *ibid.* They have endeavoured to corrupt the Scriptures, *ibid.* All learned men give the same character of the Jews and their writings, p. 224. So Mr. Le Clerc, *ibid.* Mr. Du Pin, *ibid.* Mr. Dodwell, *ibid.* Scaliger, p. 225. Naclerus, *ibid.* Buxtorf, *ibid.* Lightfoot, *ibid.* And the same character is given of them by Christ himself too, who censures them more particularly on account of their washings, p. 226. Their traditions were many and mischievous, *ibid.* All these things applied to the present dispute, *ibid.*

## LETTER X.

Arrian, from whom Mr. Wall next argues, too late to determine the matter, p. 228. He may perhaps only speak of the purifications for pollutions, *ibid.* The pagans frequently confounded the Jews and Christians together, as appears from Themistius, p. 228, 229. From

Arrian himself, p. 231. From Lucian, *ibid.* From Tacitus, *ibid.* From Suetonius, p. 232. And Rigaltius understands Arrian's words so too, *ibid.* As do also Petavius, Lipsius, and Barthius, *ibid.* Mr. Wall's argument from Gregory Nazianzen examined, p. 233. This Father lived too late to determine our dispute ; and does not speak of an initiatory baptism, *ibid.* The Scripture makes no mention of an initiatory baptism in use among the Jews, p. 234. Exod. xix. 10. makes nothing to the purpose, *ibid.* Maimonides, his rule of interpretation false, p. 236. The rabbins very bad interpreters, *ibid.* *Sanctify* does not necessarily imply *washing*, *ibid.* Nothing in the words which so much as intimates the body was to be washed, p. 237. There is no mention of an initiatory baptism in any authentic ancient history ; even though they had the fairest occasions, and ought not to have omitted it, if there had been any such usage, *ibid.* This illustrated by some instances from Josephus and Ganz, *ibid.* and 238. It is on many accounts very improbable that the Jews had any such ceremony, *ibid.* Proved from St. Paul's words, *ibid.* From Gregory Nazianzen, p. 239. From St. Peter, *ibid.* Several authors of reputation, and especially the ancients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory baptism among the Jews, *ibid.* Thus St. Barnabas, *ibid.* Justin Martyr, p. 240. Tertullian, p. 241. Origen, p. 242. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *ibid.* Many writers say our baptism came instead (not of baptism among the Jews, but) of sacrifice ; as the Recognitions, p. 242, 243. Or of the washings for pollutions, as the Apostolical Constitutions pretended, p. 243. And Mr. Hill speaks to this purpose, *ibid.* Others more commonly say it succeeds in the place of circumcision, *ibid.* The conclusion from these observations, *ibid.* Though the Jews could be proved to have baptized their proselytes, this does no service to the cause of pædobaptism, p. 244. For, 1. It does not appear that infants were admitted, *ibid.* 2. If the Jews had such a baptism as is pretended, it is no rule to Christians ; otherwise the Socinians, &c. have a good handle to lay aside the use of baptism, *ibid.* And there is no manner of analogy between the Jewish and the Christian pædobaptism, p. 245. 3. We need only go back to the baptism of St. John ; which there is more reason to think was the pattern of Christ's than a Jewish ceremony, *ibid.* St. John, Christ, and his apostles baptized no infants, p. 246. A passage of Josephus to this purpose, *ibid.* Another from Origen, p. 247. Another of St. Paul, *ibid.* 4. At best this supposed baptism of the Jews is only a traditionary ceremony from the rabbins, *ibid.* The quoting texts for it no proof of its divine institution, p. 248. The rabbins do not pretend to find an initiatory baptism in the Scriptures, *ibid.* But confess it is only a tradition of their elders, *ibid.* This proved from the words of the Talmud, *ibid.* Which are explained by some rules of Maimonides, p. 249. Exod. xix. 10. cited only by way of accommodation, p. 250. It is therefore great presumption to draw a rabbinical tradition into a precedent for the Christian



church, p. 251. These things applied to the present dispute, *ibid.* The conclusion, *ibid.*

## LETTER XI.

What is to be the particular business of the following letters, p. 253. The authority of the primitive Fathers more to be valued than Daillé and some others suppose, *ibid.* It would be easy to defend the credit of the Fathers from the cavils of these men, *ibid.* They were, doubtless, faithful in the relations they were well qualified to give of affairs in their own churches and times, *ibid.* And so far their authority is of consequence, *ibid.* But yet this is not sufficient to ground Mr. Wall's attempt upon, though they should afford ever so many full citations, p. 254. They were sometimes in the wrong, *ibid.* The two only ways to prove infant-baptism are insufficient, even though the arguments our adversaries make use of be allowed all the force they are pretended to have, p. 255. It is probable, the earliest churches practised only what they received from the apostles, *ibid.* Mr. Wall takes no notice of St. Barnabas, because he makes against infant-baptism in several places, p. 256. The passages from St. Clement examined, p. 257. Mr. Wall's argument from them stated, *ibid.* The main point on which it turns a groundless mistake, *viz.* that baptism is necessary universally to all that shall be saved, p. 258. Baptism does not appear to have been designed to wash away original sin, *ibid.* By this same argument it might as certainly be proved, that all the antipædobaptists now are for infant-baptism, p. 259. The passages from Hermas considered, *ibid.* In the passages cited, this Father speaks only of adult persons, *ibid.* John iii. 5. considered, p. 261. *Kingdom of God* does not necessarily mean the kingdom of glory, p. 262. The words cannot be taken universally, p. 264. *Tis* has no relation to infants in any place of Scripture, *ibid.* And here relates only to the subjects of whom our Lord speaks, p. 265. Who are only adult persons who have heard the word preached, *ibid.* As appears, 1. Because such only can be expected to comply with the institution, to whom only it is truly given, *ibid.* 2. Because such only can be saved by it, according to St. Peter, p. 266. Whose words the pædobaptists have never yet fairly interpreted, p. 267. Dr. Whitby's evasion considered, *ibid.* 3. The same form of speech usual, when infants are not included, p. 268. As they seem not to be in this place, by our Saviour's words in the context, p. 269. 4. The words under consideration cannot be true of infants, *ibid.* 5. Something in the words themselves limits them to adult persons, p. 270. What it is to be born of the Spirit, *ibid.* Dr. Whitby's judicious observations on the text, p. 271. Another passage of Hermas considered, *ibid.* He only describes visions, and therefore is not always to be taken literally, p. 272. He cannot mean, that persons in their separate state were or could be baptized with material water, *ibid.* He says nothing however of infant-baptism ; but rather ex-

cludes infants in this very passage, p. 273. Besides, to give up all our adversaries can reasonably desire here, it would only prove infants shall be baptized in their separate estate after death, which is nothing to our dispute, p. 274. Another passage of Hermas, *ibid.* That infants are esteemed of God, no argument they ought to be baptized, p. 274. This passage makes rather against infant-baptism, *ibid.* Hermas says several things inconsistent with it, p. 275. Matth. xix. 14. considered, *ibid.* it has no relation to baptism, p. 276. Dr. Whitby's improvement of the passage examined, *ibid.* It is probable the children were brought to be healed, *ibid.* It does not follow from these words, that they are fit to be dedicated to Christ by baptism, *ibid.* The bishop of Salisbury's assertion noted and disproved, p. 278. Conclusion, *ibid.*

## LETTER XII.

What Mr. Wall produces from the writings of the second century examined, p. 280. A passage in St. Justin considered, *ibid.* Which makes nothing for infant-baptism, p. 281. Neither does it speak of original sin as our author pretends, *ibid.* Mr. Wall has perverted the words, *ibid.* His translation of them unintelligible, *ibid.* 'Απὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ means *from Adam*, p. 282. Another misconstruction noted, *ibid.* The phrase explained by a passage in Dionysius Halicarnassæus, *ibid.* And another in Thucydides, p. 283. Another passage from St. Justin considered, *ibid.* He does not call baptism circumcision, p. 284. He could not mean baptism by the spiritual circumcision he speaks of, *ibid.* What he understands by spiritual circumcision, *ibid.* Other writers of the primitive church talk in the same manner, p. 285. Colossians ii. 11, 12. considered, p. 286. The Scripture nowhere calls baptism circumcision, *ibid.* The words in themselves are not capable of the sense our adversaries give them, p. 287. The ancients did not call baptism the circumcision without hands, as Mr. Wall pretends, p. 288. Mr. Wall's argument from the parallel between circumcision and baptism shewn to be groundless, *ibid.* The principle on which it is founded, evidently false, p. 289. Some of the consequences of it ; as, that baptism must be administered only on the eighth day, *ibid.* ; that females must not be baptized, *ibid.* As the apostles did not make circumcision their rule in relation to baptism ; so neither should we, p. 290. Another passage from St. Justin, *ibid.* It is not to be imagined he should forbear to mention infant-baptism, if it had been then practised, p. 291. Or however, he ought not to have spoken so as is inconsistent with that practice, *ibid.* The passage is directly against infant-baptism, *ibid.* The reasons why Mr. Wall cites this passage ; though he confesses it makes nothing for infant-baptism, p. 292. The first reason makes against him, *ibid.* His next reason, that regeneration is put for baptism, groundless, p. 293. St. Justin never understands regeneration so, *ibid.* Baptism

not regeneration, but the symbol of it, p. 293. The third reason contradicts his former assertion, p. 294. Another passage from St. Justin, *ibid.* Which Mr. Wall draws to his side by a very unfair translation, p. 295. Ἐκ παιδων signifies *from their childhood*, *ibid.* Illustrated by instances from Cicero, *ibid.* From Laertius, *ibid.* From Plato, p. 486. From Plutarch, *ibid.* From Origen, *ibid.* From Theophilus Antiochenus, p. 296. From the Scriptures, *ibid.* Mr. Wall himself translates a passage of St. Basil thus on another occasion, *ibid.* The famous passage from St. Irenæus considered, p. 297. It is not genuine, *ibid.* Cardinal Baronius observes, the latter part of the chapter contradicts the beginning, *ibid.* Petavius' answer to this proves nothing, p. 298. The author of the last part of the chapter attempts to confirm a manifest falsehood, by the authority of the ancients from St. John, which St. Irenæus could never have done, *ibid.* Mr. Dodwell's pretence, that St. John, &c. judged of our Lord's age by his countenance, too weak and groundless, p. 299. They could not but know the time of our Lord's birth more exactly, *ibid.* St. Irenæus could not think Christ arrived to near so much as his fortieth year; the contrary being so evident from the censual rolls then in being, and from the disputes with the adversaries of the Christian religion, *ibid.* Nay, it appears from St. Irenæus' own words, that he was not in so gross an error, p. 301. He fixes the time of the Lord's birth, *ibid.* The time of his passion computed; from the time of Pontius Pilate's government, and Tiberius' reign, *ibid.*; from the destruction of Jerusalem, &c. p. 302. Mr. Dodwell's attempt to excuse the extravagance of this spurious passage wholly useless, p. 304. Besides, the passage is taken only from a very bad translation, as learned men confess, *viz.* Scaliger, p. 304, 305. Du Pin, *ibid.* Mr. Dodwell, *ibid.* Dr. Grabe, *ibid.* This may also appear, by comparing it with the remaining fragments of the original, *ibid.* Again, the word *regenerated* in this passage does not mean baptized, p. 307. The Jews did not give rise to this way of speaking, *ibid.* The Scripture notion of regeneration, p. 308. John iii. 5. considered, *ibid.* The regeneration there mentioned consists in the operations of the Spirit, of which baptism is the sign and seal, p. 309. And this appears from our Lord's own words following, *ibid.* Titus iii. 5. considered, p. 311. That the ancients never mean baptism, but an internal change by regeneration, shewn from Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 313. Tertullian, *ibid.* Origen, p. 314. Clemens Romanus, p. 315. St. Barnabas, *ibid.* And St. Irenæus nowhere uses the word, as our author pretends he always does, p. 316. The inference from these observations, p. 318. A contradiction of Mr. Wall's, *ibid.* Another exception to the passage cited from St. Irenæus is, that *infantes* does not necessarily mean such young children as the paedobaptists admit to baptism, p. 319. *Omnis ætas* does not always include infants, *ibid.* As appears by an instance from St. Cyprian, *ibid.* The Recognitions, *ibid.* Dionysius of Alexandria, *ibid.* Nor does the enumeration of the several

ages make it necessary to understand such infants as are not capable of reason, p. 320. Infancy, according to St. Irenaeus himself, reaches to ten years of age, *ibid.* As Mr. Dodwell also thinks, p. 321. The inference, *ibid.* Persons under ten, capable of instruction and baptism, *ibid.* Recapitulation and conclusion, *ibid.*

## LETTER XIII.

An argument against infant-baptism, drawn from Polycrates' letter to Victor, p. 323. Tertullian no friend to infant-baptism; which makes Mr. Wall begin his citations from him, with decrying his authority, p. 324. His general expressions no argument for paedobaptism, *ibid.* Tertullian's steady meaning is easy to be come at, without Mr. Wall's extravagant guesses, p. 325. Tertullian's mentioning infant-baptism, no argument it was practised in his time, but only that some were endeavouring to bring in the practice, *ibid.* Tertullian does not simply advise (as Mr. Wall pretends) to defer the baptizing of children, but argues against it, as a thing that ought not to be done, p. 326. The reading of the passage on which Mr. Wall grounds his supposition altogether impertinent and absurd, *ibid.* Tertullian's doctrine concerning baptism inconsistent with paedobaptism, p. 327. His exposition of 1 Cor. vii. 14. not in favour of paedobaptism, *ibid.* Not one author of the first three centuries who understands that text of baptism, *ibid.* Mr. Wall's endeavours to prove that *ἄγιος*, &c. mean washed, &c. ineffectual, p. 328. The sense given by the bishop of Sarum and Dr. Whitby cannot be the true one, *ibid.* The best interpretation which can be made upon our author's own principles, is what he so much despises, *viz.* that by holiness is meant legitimacy, p. 329. This proved to be the true sense, *ibid.* *Holy* never signifies *baptized*, p. 330. When Mr. Wall comes to Origen, he cites some passages which are plain to his purpose, p. 331. But they are only taken from Latin translations, *ibid.* The passage some cite from the Greek remains of this Father, (as Mr. Wall himself confesses,) proves nothing, *ibid.* The Latin translations from whence the main citations are taken, are very corrupt and licentious, p. 332. Several learned men confess it, *ibid.* As Grotius, p. 333. Huetius, *ibid.* Daillé, *ibid.* Du Pin, *ibid.* Tarinus, p. 334. Which is also abundantly proved, by comparing the translation with the Greek fragments, as now extant, *ibid.* St. Hierome was not more faithful in his translations than Ruffinus, *ibid.* It is very probable they took this liberty in all other things, as well as in those particularly for which Origen was questioned, p. 335. Ruffinus, notwithstanding what Mr. Wall says to the contrary, took as much liberty with the Epistle to the Romans as he did with other books, *ibid.* He expressly says, he had added many things, p. 336. Besides, that commentary was very much interpolated before Ruffinus took it in hand, *ibid.* As to the passage taken out of the Homilies on Joshua, it is at best doubtful whether he speaks of infants in



age, p. 337. In one part of these Homilies he has inserted, though it be not in the original, this passage particularly, which is the ground of the pædobaptists' argument, *ibid.* In St. Cyprian's time infant-baptism was practised in Africa; and probably first took rise there, together with infant-communion, *ibid.* The Africans generally men of weak understanding, *ibid.* The Greek church, probably, had not yet admitted the error, p. 338. The inference from the whole, *ibid.* A recapitulation, *ibid.* A reason why so much only of Mr. Wall's history as relates to the first centuries is examined, p. 346. How infant-baptism was at first brought in use, p. 347. Errors sprung up in the church very early, *ibid.* This of infant-baptism not brought in all at once, but by degrees, *ibid.* And was occasioned in some measure by their zeal, which was not always according to knowledge, as several other things were, *ibid.* A parallel betwixt this practice and the popish notion of transubstantiation, *ibid.* When John iii. 5. was understood to relate to infants, as well as others, no wonder infants were baptized, p. 348. Upon just such another mistake of our Saviour's words in John vi. 53. the earliest pædobaptists admitted children to the Lord's supper, p. 349. Conclusion, *ibid.*

# REFLECTIONS

ON

MR. WALL'S HISTORY

OF

INFANT-BAPTISM.

---

## LETTER I.

HEATS among Christians inconsistent with their profession, and a great dishonour to Christianity—This reflection occasioned by a letter the author received, very unbecoming the character of his friend that sent it—The author endeavours to find an excuse for his friend—We are generally more subject to passion in matters of religion than in other things—His friend's great respect to the power of the Church of England, which he thinks to be the best constituted national church in the world, some sort of excuse for him—We have no infallible judge on earth—Nothing can excuse unreasonable excesses of any kind—Hard names, &c., no real prejudice to our cause—Mr. Wall's moderation only pretended—The antipædobaptists hearty friends to the present government—Those who make the greatest outcries of the church's danger, known to be her greatest enemies—Persecution for religion directly contrary to our Saviour's doctrine and example—Arguments from Scripture the proper means to convince men—The antipædobaptists open to instruction—Mr. Wall's history not so formidable as is pretended—He is not much to be depended on—His real aim and design was only to establish the baptism of infants; as appears by considering his pretence from Justin Martyr—Another from St. Cyprian—Another from the Apostolical Constitutions—He takes all occasions to blacken the antipædobaptists; disguising his designs with pretences to moderation—This charge not inconsistent with charity—Learned men are best able to judge of matters—Mr. Wall endeavours to possess his readers with an opinion of his learning, by several needless digressions, on the Decretal Epistles: on the history of Pelagianism; and, in this, on the lawfulness of oaths, and possessing riches: on the virginity of our Lord's mother: on the Socinians, and the tritheism they charge on the Fathers—This a subject too difficult for Mr. Wall—His ridiculous reflection on Mr. Stennett noted—Another artifice to gain reputation, by quarrelling with several of the greatest men for learning, &c.: as archbishop Tillotson, bishop Burnet, Rigaltius,

Gregory Nazianzen, father and son, St. Chrysostom, Mr. Le Clerc—Difference in opinion no warrant to dispense with the rules of charity—Moral virtues more acceptable to God than speculative notions—Mr. Le Clerc no Arian, Photinian, or Socinian—Mr. Wall also quarrels with Grotius—The sense of a passage in St. Gregory set right, which Mr. Wall had misrepresented—The sense of a canon of the Neocæsarean council rescued from the force Mr. Wall put upon it: as also, the words of Zonaras and Balsamon, in relation thereto—St. Austin and Pelagius speak of the end, not of the subjects of baptism—He that takes so much liberty with such men, will take more, in all probability, with the antipædobaptists—Mr. Wall has not acted the part of a faithful historian towards us—He several times, on no ground at all, takes for granted some things, merely because they favour his design—And charges the Antipædobaptists with whatever he has heard any one among them to have believed or said.

---

SIR,

ONE would think it impossible, when we consider the perfect charity and moderation which Christianity every where recommends, to find its professors so overcome with bitterness and heat. It is a great reflection on our holy religion, and nothing hardly can expose it to jest and banter more than these animosities and violent divisions, which reign among those who make the highest pretences of affection to it; who after having magnified it to others, and endeavoured to convince them of its excellence and truth, so foully contradict its piety and goodness in their actions, which are so directly opposite to that divine Spirit which breathed it forth: which discovers they have no such great opinion of it themselves, and gives the enemies of our faith but too much colour to cry it down as an imposture, and an invention of state, to frighten children and fools into subjection and slavery. Rage and fury are inconsistent with Christianity; and where these govern, that can find no place: for, what agreement can there be between a persecuting temper and the peaceful Spirit of Christ our Lord? *What communion hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial?* &c. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15. And accordingly it is to be observed, no party encourages this fiery zeal so much, as the most antichristian of all churches, viz. that of Rome.

You will easily apprehend, sir, the occasion of these *Reflections*; for, give me leave to tell you, nothing could be more unbecoming your character, either as a Christian or a learned man, than the letter you sent me. I should never have expected it from one of but tolerable sense and candour; and much less from you, who are a person of uncommon abilities and a liberal education.

I cannot tell how to express the surprise I was in, that you, of all my friends, should dip your pen so deep in gall, and treat us with so much seeming ill-nature ; and I was the more concerned, because I could think of nothing which might excuse you. It is, indeed, what I never observed in you before, during our long acquaintance ; but this only increases the present wonder : and I cannot imagine what provocation you had to it now, unless, perhaps, something extraordinary had chafed you ; and turning your thoughts, in the commotion, upon the unhappy difference between us, you were betrayed into this warmth unawares.

And it is our misfortune, indeed, that in matters of religion, where we should shew the least, we generally have the greatest passion : here our nature is more apt to take fire ; and we think it justifiable too, or rather our duty ; cheating ourselves with false pretences to a zeal for God and religion : for all things that are comprehended under that venerable name justly make a deep impression on our souls, and touch their most sensible part. From these considerations, I should be glad to frame an excuse for you ; and to give it the greater weight, I add further on your behalf, that not being a divine, you have not made it your business to examine the controversy thoroughly, but have taken it on trust from the clergy, as I fear they do too often from one another.

This, I own, is but an indifferent plea ; yet I am willing it should pass with myself, for I would fain find something which might be stretched into an excuse for a person I so much esteem. And, indeed, to one that knows you, it will not seem altogether unlikely that this was the cause. The deference and respect you pay to the Church of England, and its governors and customs, is undoubtedly very commendable, and no small argument of a devout mind : especially considering how much you are persuaded that Christ has left many things, even all that are indifferent, in the church's power ; and that therefore all ought to obey, and entirely submit to that power and authority, with which it is thus by him invested. And as to the Church of England in particular, I know you look upon her to be, by far, the purest and best constituted national church in the world, and very conformable to the primitive pattern, both in respect to the holiness of her doctrines and the usefulness of her discipline, as established in the canons and constitutions of the church : and that she eminently enjoys what is made a distinguishing character by Christ himself, in that she preserves an extensive charity ; and is in her nature an utter stranger, let some of her pretended sons be what they will, to those tyrannical principles, which are the support



of her antichristian neighbours : and all the world owns, none can boast of a more learned clergy, to maintain the interest of our most holy religion. Now these things are, doubtless, enough to create a just veneration in you for the authority and judgment of such guides ; and therefore I do not wonder that you apply to them the apostle's awful charge, 1 Cor. iv. 1, *Let a man so account of them, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.*

I am solicitous, you see, sir, to excuse the fault I think you have committed ; and have set down my thoughts just as they came to mind, that you may perceive, by their disorder, how much I am concerned. But after all, I must observe, that having no infallible judge on earth, we are not blindly to prostitute our consciences to the dictates of any power whatever, but have an undisputed right to that *liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.*

It is an unpleasing reflection, because it so much weakens the force of what I have been contriving in your excuse : but still I cannot forbear thinking, that nothing will by any means justify a rash unchristian conduct. Religion, which is the highest reason, can be no excuse for unreasonable excesses of any kind ; and therefore whoever engages in the defence of a party with the usual violence, you may be satisfied, and may take it for a general rule, has not his zeal from religion, but something which lies at bottom, of a quite contrary nature. And this your own experience must needs have confirmed to you.

However, if through the misrepresentations of others, you are persuaded to think so ill of us, and believe you have treated us as well, or it may be better than we deserve ; I only beg you would let me know the reasons on which this ill opinion of us is grounded, and I will promise impartially to consider them : and if they have any weight, I will ingenuously acknowledge it, and give up my cause. But till I can see something more conclusive than what Mr. Wall, or any else I have yet met with, have offered, I must desire you will allow me to continue my separation from the national church, and religiously adhere to that more despised one, of which, I hope, I shall never be ashamed or afraid to own myself a member.

We are very little moved at the reflections and hard names you bestow on us, whatever force you may think there is in them. 'Conceited sectaries' and 'obstinate heretics' are old calumnies. St. Paul himself did not escape them, and has taught us to confess, that *after the way which some call heresy, so worship we the God of our fathers*, Acts xxiv. 14. It is no real prejudice to our cause that

it is ridiculed, and the conscientious professors of it vilified and abused. Christ and his whole doctrine, while he was on earth, and a long time after, was not better treated; and his great example, we thank God, has encouraged us to endure all manner of reproaches for his sake with patience: we know, and he bid us remember it in the times of trouble, that we who are servants are not greater than our Lord and Master. We can never forget with how much contempt he was treated, who with wonderful patience endured whatever the malice of devils and wicked men could invent; and it is our constant prayer, that, imitating his greatness of soul, we also may *bless them who curse us, and pray for them who despitefully use us*. To suffer after him is no dishonour, but having his great example always before our eyes, we should rather rejoice, as he has encouraged us to do, when we are persecuted for his sake; for he has assured us, and we humbly trust to him to see it performed, that *if we are reviled for his sake, our reward shall be great in heaven*.

The main ground of difference between us, in my opinion, sir, is the case of baptism; but how some men can improve this to justify their traducing us as dangerous enemies to the state, I am not clearsighted enough to discern. It is true, you do not charge us with this; but yet give me leave here to observe, that a great many do, and propagate the opinion all they can: and the author you so much admire, by his inserting, among other things, the scandalous story of Mr. Hicks<sup>a</sup>, which himself can scarce forbear confessing to be false, gives me reason to fear he is of the same mind too, though he endeavours to conceal it. And though he has pretty well imitated the moderation and candour he so much pretends to, he fully discovers, at some turns, that these are only pretences: witness his asserting<sup>b</sup>, that the forbearance the states of Holland allow, and which he mischievously insinuates is, ‘outdone by another nation, is the most contrary to the nature and design of Christianity, of any thing that could be devised.’ Witness also his quotation from Dr. Featly<sup>c</sup>, who was certainly the most railing adversary in the world, and urged the words of the parable, *Compel them to come in*, as strongly as the hottest convertist in France. And Mr. Wall has such an esteem for the doctor’s principles, that in one short paragraph he cites him three times for ‘setting forth the mischiefs of a toleration in any state,’ without adding one

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. p. 216. [533.]

the second and the third.]

<sup>b</sup> Part ii. p. 388. [of the first edition: but the passage was omitted from both

<sup>c</sup> Part ii. p. 213, 214. [528.]

reason for it but the doctor's *ipse dixit*: and says, 'the observation 'the doctor made upon the first toleration that had ever been in 'England, the experience of all times since following has shewn to 'be a just one.' Why did not our author at once set himself to justify more directly the French king's acting in relation to our distressed protestant brethren, who so miserably groan under his most barbarous oppression? For Dr. Featly's principles are evidently the same with those of the French convertists.

It is therefore more than a presumption that our author's charity and moderation are still the very same as when he took so much care to perform his part with those who were endeavouring to plunder and root out the anabaptists in his neighbourhood. But whatever he may think of that matter now, there will come a time when it will be but an unpleasing reflection to him. And though he, and others like him, may strive to blacken us, by their false reports and innuendos, we are at present happy in a gracious queen<sup>d</sup>, who is not to be imposed on by these artifices against us: she is sensible we are as hearty as any of her subjects, and as ready, with the utmost hazard of our lives and fortunes, to support the crown and dignity she justly enjoys and so highly adorns. And if I know the antipædobaptists, as I think I do, I speak from my conscience, and in God's presence, I am satisfied there are not truer friends to the government, that will do more for it, according to their abilities, in the three kingdoms. It is known they acknowledge her majesty's tenderness and care of the common interest very gratefully, and make her the best return a body of private men can do, by devoutly praying for her preservation in their public assemblies.

But it seems we have the unhappiness to differ from the church in several things, which is handle enough for some persons to cry mightily against us. Perhaps they imagine, violent, noisy pretences to zeal for the church will recommend them to ecclesiastical preferments, notwithstanding, in reality, the church is the least of their concern; and after all, it may sadly be observed, that piety and true religion are almost quite lost in the midst of these zealous pretences; for those who make the greatest stir about religion are too frequently found to have the least regard to it in their lives and actions; just as the malecontents and nonjurors, who can certainly be no friends to England, raise the loudest outcries of the church's danger, when, at the same time, it is known they are the greatest enemies to it and its present establishment. How else could one

<sup>d</sup> [Anne.]



of them<sup>e</sup> so impudently propose an union with the clergy of France? A friend to that church can be no friend to this at home. Yet these are the men who begin the clamour, to the great disturbance of the catholic church; and then basely turn it upon us, by a common jesuitical figure, and cry, that we are the church's enemies, and design its ruin; and all for no other reason, sir, but because we will not intermeddle with it at all. A feint and amusement only, that they may unobserved and unsuspected betray her more effectually: for if she is in danger, it is from them; from whom, though we are thought her enemies, we unfeignedly pray God to deliver her. But she need not be apprehensive of what they can do, while her majesty is at her head, who has piously engaged to protect her, though not in the method of Rome, and of these her votaries, by crushing the innocent, and it may be, mistaken dissenters. Politics, perhaps, might persuade her to treat her avowed enemies with more severity, who dare question her title, and her supremacy in all ecclesiastical as well as civil matters, throughout her realms; which many of the clergy, contrary to their repeated most solemn oaths, publicly do; but she will never be brought to believe that God is, like the barbarous heathen daemons, to be delighted with the dreadful pomp of human sacrifices, and huge draughts of the reeking blood of poor trembling wretches.

It is strange any men should go to introduce dragoons and fagots into a system of Christian religion; for what can be more directly contrary to our Saviour's doctrine and example, than malice and oppression and massacres? or more preposterous, than to send them to hell (for they damn all heretics thither) to save their souls? While, on the other hand, charity and mutual forbearance, and to treat one another like brethren, are the blessed fruits and consequences of his most holy doctrines; and whatever may be insinuated, these are the things our principles teach us. We desire to be his disciples, and therefore following his holy instructions, we resolve *to love one another*<sup>f</sup>; and if any creep in among us of a contrary temper, we heartily renounce both them and their practices. But enough of this.

<sup>e</sup> [The allusion is evidently to the learned Henry Dodwell; and probably to that piece of his, entitled 'An account of the fundamental principle of Popery as it is a distinct Communion,' &c., (8<sup>o</sup>. 1676; again, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1688,) where, at section 25, the author says;—'upon the suppositions now mentioned, I do not see any reason to despair of so much

'liberty to be allowed by them [the Romanists] as would suffice to reconcile our communions. And this I believe will be an information very useful, and very acceptable to all hearty desirers of the peace of Christendom; that is, indeed, to all truly Christian spirits.']

<sup>f</sup> John xiii. 35.



Persons of more honour, and better understanding and temper, pursue more commendable methods ; and as Christ hath committed to them *the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God*, they employ that alone to defend his church and truth. And undoubtedly the most effectual way to suppress error is (and it is the only one Christ has provided) by arguments drawn from the Scriptures ; which are, in their own nature, most proper to convince the judgment, and work upon the affections too. This is the business and indispensable duty of every careful shepherd of Christ's flock, over the consciences of whom he has no power, but to teach, *and knowing the terror of the Lord, to persuade men.*

But, you say, 'This has been always our pretence, and we have ' constantly commended this method, because it is so gentle, and we ' can easily put by the force of it ; for we seem resolved to take very ' little notice of what is done in this kind ; or at least, obstinately ' to cavil at it, though ever so unreasonably.' But indeed, sir, you wrong us very much ; for if we are in error, we heartily desire to be convinced of it ; and every one must acknowledge, we are not tied to our opinion by reputation and interest ; since it rather deprives us of those honours and valuable promotions in the state and church we might otherwise enjoy a share of. Though for my own part, those advantages do not in the least tempt my utmost ambition, to make me, in disobedience to God and my conscience, deny what I know and believe to be right ; yet out of mere respect to truth, I shall ever think myself obliged to any man who kindly takes pains to undeceive me in a matter he thinks I am mistaken in, and shall always be open to instruction ; and as far as I can judge of our whole body, they are ready to embrace the truth, and renounce their errors, as soon as they shall be made appear to be such by authentic proofs. And this character Mr. Wall himself too allows us, among other things to the same effect, adding these words ; ' I take them generally to be cordial, open, and frank ' expressers of their sentiments.'

You call this also, ' the old cant, and hope we will no more make ' use of it, till we have answered what is so learnedly written against ' us by Mr. Wall ; who has, you think, most effectually ruined our ' cause, in the judgment of all reasonable, considerate men.' But that you are mistaken in your opinion of his book, and that Mr. Wall has done our cause no prejudice, nor is the formidable adversary you represent him to be, is as clear to me as the contrary seems to you,

and perhaps you may be persuaded shortly to think so too. I confess I look on what he has done as the best defence of infant-baptism extant, and therefore it deserves an answer. And you may expect a complete one, by a very learned hand<sup>h</sup>, which, it is likely, may go far toward putting an end to the controversy; but the person who undertakes it, is under such avocations, that I doubt it will be some time before it can be published. In the meanwhile, therefore, I will set myself to obey your commands, (for such I esteem the requests of my friends,) and the more willingly, that I may confirm you in the good opinion you are pleased to express of me: you think I have so much ingenuity, as to follow truth wherever I find it; and since I persist in my former notion, you are willing to believe I have something which appears a reason to me, to offer in my defence; and on this account, you shall be glad, you say, to know my sentiments of Mr. Wall's book; which I will give you, without prejudice or heat, and I hope the consequence will be the continuance of your friendship.

I esteem Mr. Wall's, I said, the best defence of infant-baptism I have seen; and that for those reasons on which he recommends it himself in his preface. I believe, indeed, they are not all sound; but he all the way endeavours to impose them on the reader with such an air as shall make them pass for such with many. Besides, it must be allowed he has, in some respects, argued to more advantage than any before him, having reaped the benefit of their writings; but with all his advantages, and though he stands on the shoulders of those who have gone before him, his size is not so gigantic that we need be afraid to engage him, and enter the dispute. But before I come to particulars, it may be proper to make some general remarks, which will be of service to us, when we consider the several arguments wherein his strength lies.

In the first place, sir, I must desire you to believe Mr. Wall is not every where to be depended on: he represents some things so unfairly, and others in so false a light, that he is not to be read without much caution and distrust. He would be thought, indeed, a mighty fair and impartial writer, and to this end endeavours to conceal the contrary bias he was under; and he has done it so successfully too, that he has had the good fortune generally to gain the reputation he aimed at; but how undeservedly, I will leave you, though so much his friend, to judge, by the following instances:

<sup>h</sup> [Mr. Joseph Stennet, a learned minister, author of the answer to David Russen's 'Fundamentals,' &c. 1704. For

some account of him and his works, consult Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. iv. p. 319-326, also Ivimey's Baptists.]

He tells us in the titlepage, his design is ‘impartially to collect ‘all the passages in the writers of the first four centuries, as do ‘make either for or against infant-baptism.’ And afterwards he says ‘he has produced all he has met with in the authors that wrote ‘in the first four centuries<sup>h</sup>,’ and that he has done it in ‘their own ‘words, without omitting any that he knows of<sup>i</sup>’ within the limited time. He assures us of it again in another place<sup>k</sup>, in order to remove all doubts, and persuade you that he has not suffered a single instance to escape his diligence, especially in the earliest ages. But I am positive I could easily point out several passages, all cited from writers in the first three centuries, which he has taken no notice of, and each of them stronger in favour of antipædobaptism than any he produces for the contrary, till St. Cyprian’s time. This is not the proper place, but if there is occasion, I intend to give you some hereafter, when they may more conveniently fall in; at present, I shall only observe, he discovers his design, notwithstanding his pretences to impartiality, was to establish the baptism of infants, I had almost said *per fas et nefas*. For after a long quotation from Justin Martyr’s first apology, which does not in the least touch on the baptism of infants, as Mr. Wall himself confesses, he makes the reader put the question<sup>l</sup>, ‘To what purpose this is cited in a discourse of infant-baptism?’ plainly intimating it did not directly serve his secret real design, the baptism of infants not being spoken of in it; however, to balance the matter, he says, it makes nothing against it neither, in which he is manifestly in the wrong.

The martyr is there giving the emperor an account of the Christian form of baptizing in general, as it was administered to all; and not, as Mr. Wall takes the freedom, without any ground, to suppose, to those only who were converted from heathenism, thereby introducing two baptisms into the church, contrary to the express words of St. Paul<sup>m</sup>, and making Justin most imprudently fall into what he was endeavouring to avoid, namely, the suspicion of ‘dealing ‘unfairly,’ by concealing something from the emperor’s knowledge. But to fortify his conjecture he adds, the reason of the martyr’s profound silence in the matter was, that ‘he had no occasion to ‘speak of the case of infants.’

A very disingenuous assertion! as you cannot but think it, sir, if you call to mind the scandal Christians were commonly under, in those days, which St. Justin himself and all the apologists are so careful to remove; I mean, their being taxed with murdering

<sup>h</sup> Part ii. p. 1. [332.]

<sup>i</sup> Introd. p. 2. [2.]

<sup>k</sup> Part ii. p. 8. [338.]

<sup>l</sup> Part i. p. 15. [69.]

<sup>m</sup> Eph. iv. 5.

their children at their meetings, and feasting on their flesh. For this calumny was industriously spread among the pagans, and the Christians cleared themselves very well; but without disparaging the arguments they employed, I will venture to say, the baptism of infants, if it had been in use among them, might have been urged with as much weight as any, and they would certainly have thought it as conclusive, and not have passed it over with a total neglect.

On the whole, I infer, and I hope not without reason, this passage of St. Justin is directly against infant-baptism; and therefore, when Mr. Wall says, it is not directly for his purpose, that must imply, whatever he pretends, his aim was only to find out what might be most plausibly offered for the opinion he had before entertained. I draw this inference not from this passage alone, but from several others also in his book, and from what I am going to add in the next place, which perhaps you may esteem the plainer proof.

After our author has laboured<sup>n</sup> to establish the credit of St. Cyprian, and his testimonies for infant-baptism, supposing the reader sufficiently prepared to understand all that Father says of baptism, as including pædobaptism too; he presents us with a citation out of his commonplace-book, as Mr. Wall terms it, where St. Cyprian, to shew the necessity of regeneration *and* baptism, (not *or* baptism, which would have answered Mr. Wall's end better,) uses the words of St. John, *Except a man be born<sup>o</sup>, &c.*, and then suddenly changing the person, because St. Cyprian quoted St. John, he substitutes St. John's authority in the room of St. Cyprian's, and runs on as if he was only arguing from that sacred testimony, to fix the sense of those words in some particulars he had most occasion for, and which have really no difficulty in them.

Thus having passed it on you, that St. Cyprian does sometimes speak in favour of infant-baptism, and then taking it for granted he does it here too; he shifts authorities, after his singular method of improving things, and makes a descant on the words of St. John, in hopes to carry it with the credulous reader; and at last concludes, that from these considerations we may *see plainly* this is a good testimony for infant-baptism.

And as he represents it, indeed, it seems to have some weight. But pray, sir, observe the fallacy: to persuade you that St. Cyprian means nothing but water-baptism, he unfairly cuts off these words taken out of the same gospel, *Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you<sup>p</sup>*; which immediately follow those cited by Mr. Wall, and make up this whole chapter.

<sup>n</sup> Part i. p. 57, 58. [91.]

<sup>o</sup> John iii. 5.

<sup>p</sup> John vi. 53.



As if he foresaw they would lessen the testimony he was so fond of, and therefore, in point of prudence, might be omitted: for it is clear from them, that by *regenerate* in the text, St. Cyprian did not understand baptism only, nor at all indeed, for that word seems plainly to refer to these words, John vi. 53; and also, that he pleads as strongly for the necessity of communicating infants, as baptizing them.

Mr. Wall therefore, being pressed afterwards<sup>a</sup> by Mr. Daillé's argument from this passage, to prove infants were admitted, in St. Cyprian's time, to the eucharist, would extricate himself, by owning, in express terms, when he thinks it has first had its effect in this place, that 'it would be but a very weak argument for 'infant-baptism, were it not that he himself (viz. St. Cyprian) in 'other places mentions infants by name, as contained under the 'general rule that requires baptism;' and with this confession of his disingenuity, he thinks to ward off the force of Mr. Daillé's argument. But this does him no manner of kindness; for whatever may appear from other passages to have been St. Cyprian's judgment in the case, if this particular passage does not prove it, (as he confesses it does not,) a man of his pretended impartiality should not have insisted on it. Besides, whatever he would have us believe, he must needs perceive, those texts being joined together without any thing between them but a necessary copula, under the same head, and unavoidably applied to the same subject, the passage is either of no use to confirm infant-baptism, or else it may be as well urged for their being admitted to the awful sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To save you the trouble of turning to the place, I will transcribe the whole chapter, which Mr. Wall did not think fit to do, that you may see whose reasons are best grounded. The general head of this chapter in St. Cyprian is, 'Except any one be 'baptized and born again, he cannot come to the kingdom of God: 'and the chapter itself runs thus:

'In the Gospel according to St. John: *Except any one is born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. For that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.* And again: *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.*'

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. p. 355. [629.]

<sup>r</sup> Lib. iii. Testimonior. ad Quirin. cap. 25. 'Ad regnum Dei nisi baptizatus et renatus quis fuerit, pervenire non posse.' 'In Evangelio cata Joannem; Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non

'potest introire in regnum Dei. Quod enim natum est de carne, caro est: et quod natum est de Spiritu spiritus est. Item illic: Nisi ederitis carnem Filii hominis, et biberitis sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis.'

This is the entire chapter, without any alteration, just as it is published by the learned bishop Fell.

He has acted with the same artifice in relation to the Apostolical Constitutions, as they are called. For he produces words from the sixth book, direct indeed to his purpose; only they, like all the other boasted clear proofs, unluckily happen to be spurious, and foisted in, as many other things were, during the fourth century, as he himself is forced to confess. And how he can make them of any authority then, I leave his own conscience to answer. He gives but an indifferent account of their collection into one body at first, nor dares deny their being frequently altered afterwards, and interpolated till about the fourth century. Monsieur Jurieu also questions their antiquity, and says, ‘They are a work of the fourth age, and perhaps ‘the fifth<sup>s</sup>.’ It is certain they have been considerably altered since Epiphanius’ time, who died in the fifth century; for of the many passages he quotes from them, some are very different, others are contrary, and some not to be found, as they are read now.

These circumstances, if Mr. Wall had been unprejudiced, would have sunk the authority of the Constitutions very low with him. And to shew I am not mistaken, in another place<sup>t</sup> he uses them meanly himself. He could not avoid owning they mentioned communicating of infants, which made it not for his purpose they should be well thought of; and therefore he tacks about, and undervalues them to such a degree, that he thinks them not worth an answer. So plain is it, by his own words and management, that he endeavours to persuade his readers, by straining a passage, which, according to his own confession, is not to his purpose. And what can we expect, sir, from such a writer? I wish, for his own sake, he had considered a little sooner of what he afterwards says<sup>u</sup>, ‘That ‘any antipædobaptist,’ I add, or pædobaptist either, ‘who having ‘better means of knowledge, is convinced that any of these arguments have really no force, and yet does urge them on the more ‘ignorant people, acts very disingenuously towards them, and is a ‘prevaricator in the things of God. For to use any argument with ‘an intent to deceive, hath in it (though there be no proposition ‘uttered that is false *in terminis*) the nature of a lie: which, as it is ‘base and unmanly in human affairs, so it is impious when it is ‘pretended to be for God; as Job says, ch. xiii. 7.’

How little Mr. Wall is to be relied on, appears further, if you

<sup>s</sup> Lett. Pastorale 9. an. 1686. ‘Cette ‘compilation qu’on appelle les Constitutions Apostoliques, est un ouvrage du ‘quatrième siècle, et peut être du cinqui-

ème.’ [Or, translated into English, 8vo. London, 1689. page 194.]

<sup>t</sup> Part ii. p. 360. [635.]

<sup>u</sup> Part ii. p. 382. [657.]

observe how industriously he takes all advantages to blacken us, and render us the objects of resentment and contempt, by many things which are carefully scattered through his whole book: that a man who sets himself to write with this temper and design will say any thing that favours his intention, a common knowledge of the world will acquaint us by infinite examples. When an author once makes it his business to expose and defame his adversary, he never fails to mention every thing that may discredit him: old stories, though ever so false and scandalous, are repeated anew; all former wounds torn open afresh, and raked into to the very bone; and those animosities, which had been happily extinguished and effaced by a more charitable temper, or else considerably worn out by time, are again revived, and perhaps with new improvements of malice. He gives his own cause the most pleasing colours, and insinuates himself into your belief with specious pretences of argument, and an air of probability and assurance: for, as Tully observes, ‘There is nothing so ‘absurd and incredible, but may be represented so as to look very ‘probable<sup>x</sup>.’

But this is not all: there is another invention, and that is, to assume an appearance of impartiality and equanimity, and talk much of it; and under this disguise, to insert such innuendos and expressions as will provoke the passion of hasty bigots against his antagonists. Thus to make them look like criminals and dangerous persons, it is pretended they are liable to the lash of the law, but are spared out of generosity and tenderness; that their principles and main design are to overturn both church and state; that they have some pernicious interest to carry on, some ambition or some passion to gratify; and are a sort of obstinate *boutefeux* and heretics; and to secure all, a great many scandalous falsehoods are officiously obtruded on the credulous, as diligently as if they were the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. And if I can form any judgment, Mr. Wall has too near approached this method.

You will be surprised, I know, sir, at so severe a charge from me, who have always so much talked of and admired charity, as the most amiable, darling attribute of the Almighty; *for God is love<sup>z</sup>*; witness the amazing instance of it in his redeeming us from the curse by the sacrifice of his only-begotten Son. But you must not upbraid me with violating even the strictest rules of charity, which the doctrine and example of the blessed Jesus have taught us, and which I pray God I may always diligently study to observe. I am

<sup>x</sup> Paradox. cap. i. ‘Nihil est tam incredibile, quod non dicendo fiat probabile.’

<sup>y</sup> [*Boute-feu*, an incendiary, a sower of discord.]

<sup>z</sup> 1 John iv. 8.



very backward, and you must be sensible of it, to use so much as an ordinary liberty of censuring the actions of others; nothing grates more upon my natural temper, than to tell unwelcome truths, and lay men's faults before them. I much rather choose, which perhaps is the contrary extreme, to pass them by, for the most part, in silence; and I would willingly have done so here, if I had not believed it would be a manifest prejudice to the truth; for I saw what success his arts had with you, and therefore I thought it altogether seasonable to distinguish those things in our author which justly render all he says suspected; and when you find what full proof I can make of all I tax him with, I hope you will be satisfied I have done nothing inconsistent with the noble principles of charity I profess and so much magnify; but, on the contrary, was even obliged by them to do you and our cause this piece of justice. In the meanwhile, if any thing really blameworthy or indecent has slipped from me, I heartily beg pardon of you and Mr. Wall, and shall be very sorry whenever I perceive it.

It is generally allowed, and justly, that men of the greatest learning and penetration, who are duly furnished with proper materials, and have taken considerable pains to search out the truth, are best qualified to judge in any case, and are most to be depended on. We are naturally pretty much inclined to submit ourselves, in a good degree, to their resolutions. Mr. Wall was apprised of this, and that the far greater part of your church acknowledge (as abundance have done in my hearing) they practise infant-baptism more on the authority of the learned, venerable body of their clergy, than for any reason they see either in the Scriptures or in the nature of the thing. It very much concerned him, therefore, to preserve this esteem in the minds of the people; lest, if it wore off, they should start from their lethargy, look about them, and bravely assume the liberty of judging for themselves, and refuse to be led any longer in shackles.

I am apt to think this put Mr. Wall to the fruitless pains of introducing so many things, which are really nothing to the purpose, but only as they serve his ostentation, and to display his reading. Thus, for instance, of what use in a discourse of infant-baptism is a history of the false Decretal Epistles of the bishops of Rome?<sup>z</sup> when at the same time he allows, and we do not ask him to prove it, they are spurious, and forged by an ignorant Romanist, viz. all of them before Siricius, who came to the chair about 385. As superfluous to the full is his tedious and partial history of Pelagius, and the heresy

<sup>z</sup> Part i. p. 175. [200.]



which takes its name from him, which reaches quite through that long nineteenth chapter, and fills near a hundred pages of his first part, which contains but three hundred and sixty in all, including the title, preface, and introduction.

He offers, it is true, to excuse the digression<sup>a</sup>, but I think very indifferently; for whatever he may think of the matter, it neither illustrates nor enforces his arguments in the least; which would have been as clear and valid, though he had saved himself and his reader all that trouble; but then he would not so well have gratified his ambition to be thought a man of more than ordinary learning and application. I wonder he did not, with the same excuse, draw in more such histories at every turn, which offered as fair, and might have done him as much service as these; for I cannot see, how the sense of the other places can be apprehended better than those of St. Augustin, &c., unless he had taken the same pains largely to shew on what occasions they were spoken likewise.

But even in this digression, which was long enough in reason without it, it falls so luckily in his way, he must needs treat of the lawfulness of an oath, and possessing great riches without giving all to the poor; both which, it is said, the Pelagians held were damnable. This is perfect excursion, when a bare narration had sufficed, especially considering he was out upon the ramble already; and that neither these things, nor what gave him occasion to mention them, have any relation to his subject.

A little after, he launches out again, and will by no means allow the blessed Virgin to have been without sin, since he found the Pelagians made the belief of it a necessary article. But I must once more remark to you, all this is nothing but trifling; for whether she was the immaculate, adorable Virgin the papists idolatrously maintain, or only the holy mother of our Lord, according to the Scriptures, how is the present controversy affected by it? Infants may or may not have as much right as adult persons to Christian baptism, whichever of these opinions is true.

But I am weary with following our author through things of this nature; and therefore will only add, out of a multitude, one more of his sallies, because it is very long and very impertinent. It is in the second part, and employs no less than twenty pages, viz. from a hundred to the end of the chapter. He takes occasion there severely to scourge the Socinians, and all that he fancies favour them any way; and, as always when he touches this point, which is pretty frequently, he discovers abundance of heat, and, I think, is

<sup>a</sup> Preface, p. 9.

constantly transported even beyond the bounds of civility and good manners.

Whether the Fathers held a numerical or only a specific union in the *Divine nature*, has been warmly disputed by several considerable men; and is a branch of one of the most celebrated and intricate controversies in divinity; this might tempt Mr. Wall, perhaps, to think it a fair opportunity for him to shew his abilities in determining a matter of this nature. But it had been more to his honour, if he had used a little moderation, and not been altogether so dogmatical, which has too much of the preceptor to please any but the ignorant, who are mightily taken with noise and confidence, which is always to such the best reason and the best eloquence.

But yet I cannot see any great execution Mr. Wall has done: for though I am as far from Socinianism, or tritheism either, which he believes is charged on the Fathers by Mr. Le Clerc, &c., and which I am persuaded they are perfectly clear of; though I am as far, I say, from these two extremes as any man living, yet I cannot help thinking, there are some difficulties too great for Mr. Wall to master, if we may be allowed to judge from the specimen he has given us of his skill. And it must be confessed, either through incaution<sup>b</sup>, or whatever else may be fancied the reason, there are passages in the ancients which require a curious headpiece to excuse.

After all, he could not expect to win much reputation by transient reflections on so copious a subject; for at best, those short sketches can signify but very little: and therefore, since the matter is so very extensive, and very intricate too, I wish he had not meddled with it here; for one cannot forbear inquiring, to what purpose? and how it is brought into a discourse of this nature? I do not see any other reason that could prompt him to it, than only an indiscreet ambition to magnify himself and his learning. It is this, perhaps, makes him run so much upon the Socinians in several places, who, by his leave, are not so despicable a sort of men as he would have us think; witness, besides other things, Crellius' famous treatise, *De Uno Deo Patre*: which, after all his ovations and triumphs, yet wants a substantial answer; and I am glad to find so learned a man as Dr. Whitby of the same mind. Not but that I am persuaded, all that is there so ingeniously and advantageously urged, might be effectually confuted to general satisfaction; if the doctor, or some other learned hand, who is furnished, like him, with all necessary qualifications, would in good earnest set about it.

I mention these things, sir, to convince you Mr. Wall's digressions

<sup>b</sup> Part ii. p. 115, 116. [434, 435.]

are neither necessarily brought in, nor skilfully handled; which renders him the more inexcusable: for who can be prevailed on to think well of the conduct of that man, who, without any kind of necessity, takes such a world of pains to expose himself? And I believe, by this time, you are ready to grant it; and that I have assigned the most probable reason of it. How ridiculous and mean must it then appear for him, of all men, to reflect so unjustly on Mr. Stennett, as if he had needlessly translated so many pages of French, only to shew his 'vein of fine language<sup>c</sup>,' of which he is a master; when it is certain the whole passage was directly and very much to his purpose? while this man's own digressions are longer, and utterly foreign to the matter in hand. But he knew what kind of influence these methods would have on the people of his party, and has, without doubt, found his account in fitting his calculations to that meridian; which brings to mind an observation of his own, 'that there is a sort of people that take a malicious pleasure in 'trying how broad affronts the understandings of some men will 'bear.'

Another thing our author so industriously improves to the same purpose must not be omitted: it is an ill-natured pleasure indeed he takes in arraigning and censuring very severely some of the greatest men for wit and learning that have appeared. Nobody can read him without observing, how liberal he is of his quarrelsome criticisms, and how free he makes with their characters, without any deference to their station: doubtless, designing to place himself above them, and to be understood to be a person of much better apprehension; or at least to have dived deeper into the knowledge of things.

I am unwilling to bear too hard upon Mr. Wall, and therefore would not say he designed a reflection on that worthy man archbishop Tillotson, when he gives him an inferior title, barely styling him *bishop*<sup>d</sup>; whereas he never was a mere bishop in his life: it looks therefore as if he questioned his grace's title to that high dignity he was so deservedly raised to, or else disallowed of the order of an archbishop; though otherwise, indeed, I see no reason to think him an enemy to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But my lord of

<sup>c</sup> Part ii. p. 287. [of the first edition: the passage referred to does not occur in the second or third.]

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. p. 384. [Dr. Wall corrected this (surely unimportant) mistake, in his third edition. Mr. Gale might have observed, if it suited his views, that the same inaccuracy of expression is used, not

once only, but twenty or thirty times, towards archbishop Ussher; who is quoted (I believe invariably) as 'bishop Ussher'; although almost the whole of his learned works were composed and published after he had obtained the Archbishopric of Armagh.]

Sarum is more apparently vilified. Mr. Wall does not name him indeed, but every one knows who is ‘the author of the late Ex-‘position of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.’ And for the indecent treatment he has given to a man of his lordship’s character and high station in the church, I refer you to the place cited below<sup>e</sup>.

Every man is at liberty to think as he can, and to defend his opinions upon occasion; and, if it be necessary, handsomely to shew the mistakes he thinks any great man has been guilty of: but this should be done with all decorum to his parts and character, which is very much wanting in Mr. Wall, especially in the second chapter of his second part, where he professedly calls to account several learned moderns, who have, or seem to have, written in favour of antipædobaptism; as Ludovicus Vives, Curcellæus, Rigaltius, bishop Taylor, bishop Barlow, Bilius, Daillé, &c. As to Rigaltius, he makes Dr. Fell, the *zealous bishop of Oxford*, his precedent; but his lordship’s being a little warm on this occasion, who at other times shews Rigaltius the ‘respect which his great learning deserved,’ will in no wise justify Mr. Wall’s being continually out of temper, as perhaps he expected it should; for this may easily be pardoned in a man of his lordship’s elevation towards one of an inferior rank.

When he wants their authority, our author is full of veneration to the writers of antiquity; and is mightily enraged at any one that ventures to say the least thing to their discredit; for it is no less than blasphemy with him, and touches Christianity so home, that if pursued it would drive it out of the world. But afterwards, when they stand too much in his way, he is as rough with them as any, and gives them no more quarter than the rest of their enemies do. Thus Gregory Nazianzen, father and son, are but indifferently handled. The father<sup>f</sup> is represented an ignorant man, and of very mean capacities; and the son is a trimmer, who, merely in complaisance to his ignorant father, persuades men, against his conscience, to neglect what he knows is their duty, and take the liberty to defer the baptism of their children to a more convenient time than he believed Christ and his church at first saw fit to appoint. An odd character of bishops of the Christian church, whose order enhances, and not (as Mr. Wall vainly imagines) in the least extenuates the crime; for the priesthood, if any, and especially the bishops, ought strictly to maintain the purity of our Lord’s institu-

<sup>e</sup> Part ii. p. 124. [This passage had been altered by the author in his *second* edition.]

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. p. 372. [646.]

<sup>g</sup> Part i. p. 82. [113.] and part ii. p. 61. [386.]



tions, and be, as the apostle says, in all respects, *blameless*<sup>h</sup>. But Mr. Wall had rather they should appear such as he has described them, than make any figure against him; for so he finds their practice and testimony to be, and has no other way to come off, but this, and pretending they were singular<sup>i</sup> in this practice; and yet unwarily, a few lines after, he confesses it was very common at that time for persons to defer their children's baptism till they were in danger of death.

He is yet bolder with St. Chrysostom, and, I think, with less cause. That Father's way of arguing against circumcision, indeed, will hold as well against pædobaptism; but his design does not seem to have been anything that way; and it being not material to our purpose, I shall not examine it. For however this be, I am sure it savours too much of somewhat I do not care to name, to represent so great a man, and a bishop of the illustrious see of Constantinople, as a leaden-headed logician<sup>k</sup>, whom all the ancients justly admired for his masterly eloquence and exemplary piety.

But of all he concerns himself with, he singles out the learned Grotius and Mr. Le Clerc in chief; he carefully catches at all opportunities to bring these upon the stage. His memory never fails him for the latter, whom he hales in so unaccountably, as if one great reason of his writing this history was, that he might find opportunities to quarrel with a man of his figure in the world. Mr. Le Clerc, I believe, will never think it worth his while to take notice of our author's reflections; for he has some time since published, in the third part of the *Ars Critica*<sup>l</sup>, the reasons, in a letter to Mr. Limborch, why he neglects the calumnies of much more considerable men; and it would be well our author would do himself the kindness to read them. It concerns us to be acquainted with Mr. Wall's sincerity, and therefore let us a little examine the case.

You may observe he is angry with Mr. Le Clerc chiefly on these two accounts; because he endeavours with so 'foul a mouth'<sup>m</sup> to vilify the Fathers and their writings; and the other is, his suspected heterodoxy concerning the blessed Trinity, and particularly the Deity of Christ. This is the common objection of all Mr. Le Clerc's enemies, for which they most bitterly exclaim against him,

<sup>h</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. p. 59. and 61. [384 and 386.]

<sup>k</sup> Part i. p. 111. [The expression here rather unfairly quoted, had been altered by the author in his *second* edition.]

<sup>l</sup> [See Jo. Clerici *Ars Critica*, 3 tom. 8o. Amstelodami. 1699.]

<sup>m</sup> Part ii. p. 114, [435,] 117, [436,] &c. and 343. [In the first passage, p. 433, the expressions had been altered in the *second* edition. In the third passage, Dr. Wall substituted the words 'extravagant author,' in the *third* edition.]

though very unjustly, and oftentimes in very bad language too. But it ought to be considered, whether a different sentiment, or suspending the judgment in so abstruse a point, is a sufficient warrant to dispense with the rules of charity and forbearance, which the great incarnate God so repeatedly enjoins, and has made the discriminating badge of his disciples. It is dreadfully severe to damn men, because they cannot ‘find out the Almighty to perfection;’ for ‘who then can be saved?’ But, thanks be to God, the Scriptures give us better hopes, and at the same time assure us their condition is much the more dangerous, who so freely presume to judge their brethren; *For thou art inexorable, O man,* (says St. Paul, Rom. ii. 1.) *whosoever thou art, that judgest.*

Besides, such men, in effect, do nothing less than oppose themselves to the merciful designs of our great Redeemer, and strive to frustrate his kind endeavour to make us like himself, while he would teach us those admirable virtues of meekness, love, and good-will, &c. And though he has been pleased to take so much more care to fix us right in the practice of these things, than in the speculations which disturb us; yet an exact conformity in these weighty matters, which our Lord himself lays so much stress on, a spotless conversation, a pious life in all godliness and honesty, are not protection powerful enough to secure men from the insults of these Furiosos; as if they thought all moral virtues were nothing, without being right in the notion of the Trinity; and that this one speculation might compensate for the want of all other good qualities: and I believe, sir, you may have observed, with me, that many of these fiery zealots are none of the exactest men in their lives. But God grant they may in time consider that most charitable warning our gracious Lord has given them of their danger, beforehand assuring them, *Not every one that saith unto him, Lord! Lord!* and in words only acknowledge his mighty power and attributes, *shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he only that doeth the will of his Father which is in heaven.*

But what considerably aggravates the crime in the present case is, that the charge is utterly false; and it is strange, persons that pretend to justice and honour should exclaim against Mr. Le Clerc on such slender grounds, who must be acknowledged a man of great piety and learning. For the substance of all they urge, with any manner of probability, is, that his interpretations of several portions of Scripture destroy the fine glosses others have built upon them; and that he has gone about to shew that the Fathers did not altogether understand this mystery in the present orthodox sense.

Hence some angry men proceed to accuse him of Socinianism, some (for they are not agreed) of Arianism, and others again of Photinianism; but they all join to reproach him, though for no reason, as I can discover, but his refusing to strain any text which he believes in his conscience is not to the purpose, as men of no mean figure have done. A method which he rightly thinks only serves to expose the cause they pretend to vindicate.

By the way, sir, I would not be thought to justify all his expositions; some of them I receive, and thank him for; but not all: and I know Mr. Le Clerc will not be offended at my dissenting. The question is not whether his interpretations are just or not; he thinks they are, and has a right therefore to propose them, without being stunned with such hideous outeries of Socinianism, &c., especially since in several parts of his works he has cleared himself to the satisfaction of any impartial readers. I opened the third volume of his *Ars Critica*, and the following places in his letter to his grace the present archbishop of Canterbury turned up.

The letter was occasioned by some too severe reflections that had been cast on him by the learned Dr. Cave, and which the doctor himself knows are not very agreeable with the pure charitable spirit which ennobled primitive Christianity. It is not our business to enter into the merits of their controversy; any one who will take the pleasure to read the volume of letters I refer to, may perceive how much Mr. Le Clerc has been abused, and withal how able he is to defend himself. What is more immediately to our purpose is, that the doctor had suggested Mr. Le Clerc was either Arian or Photinian, he did not certainly know which: but considering the wide difference between these two opinions, and that the Arians anathematized the Photinians, and were the most active in that council which deposed, and procured the banishment of, Photinus bishop of Sirmium in the year 351; it is strange, as Mr. Le Clerc observes, that any man should so express himself, as to make it plain he was a favourer of one of these parties, and yet leave it so hard to determine, that the doctor himself should not be able to guess which. For his satisfaction, Mr. Le Clerc assures him he is neither. But take in short what is sufficient to wipe off the slander, in his own words:

‘<sup>n</sup> Whether Eusebius was an Arian or no signifies little to me, who am so far from being one, that I think them in a great error,

<sup>n</sup> Epist. ii. p. 68. Parum mea interest, an Eusebius Arianus fuerit, necne, qui cum Arianis minime sentio, imo eos in gravi errore versatos existimo; et qui

fidem meam ex solis Novi Testamenti Tabulis pendere profiteor, non ex Eusebii aliorumve Patrum scriptis.

‘and declare, my faith depends on the books of the New Testament alone, and not on the writings of Eusebius, or any other Father.’ Two pages further he says<sup>o</sup>, ‘I neither approve the opinion of the ‘Arians, nor the Photinians’ way of interpreting those Scriptures ‘which speak of the divinity of Christ.’ He assures us also, in the same letter, that<sup>p</sup> ‘neither of those opinions, viz. Arian or Socinian, ‘can be learned from his writings.’

In his Parrhasiana, disproving the calumnies of some German divines, a very rigid sort of people, he says in so many words<sup>q</sup>, ‘He is in nowise a Socinian.’ And in another place<sup>r</sup>; ‘If they ‘understand by it, the divinity of the Son, his distinction from the ‘Father, and the redemption of mankind, Mr. Le Clerc is more ‘convinced of these things than the most zealous Cocceian of ‘them all.’

He has one passage in this chapter that strikes at the very root of Socinianism, which, you know, sir, is, that the doctrine of the Trinity is perfectly unintelligible; hence they inferred it was a contradiction, and, in the next place, false: and because Mr. Le Clerc so handsomely removes all these pretences, I will transcribe the passage at large:

‘<sup>s</sup>Not that, according to Mr. Le Clerc’s principles, we must ‘expect to have clear and complete ideas of all things revelation

<sup>o</sup> Epist. ii. p. 70. Nec Arianorum probò sententiam, nec eam rationem, qua Photiniani Scripturæ loca de Christi divinitate interpretantur.

<sup>p</sup> Page 71. Certè neutram harum opinionum ex meis libellis haurire potuit.

<sup>q</sup> Tom. i. p. 405. Mr. L. C. n’est nullement Socinien, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. p. 435. Que si l’on entendoit par là la Divinité du Fils, sa distinction d’avec le Père, et la redemption du genre humain; Mr. L. C. en est plus convaincu que ne le sont les plus zélés Cocceïens.

<sup>s</sup> Parrhasian. tom. i. p. 418. Ce n’est pas que, selon les principes de Mr. L. C. nous devons avoir des idées claires et complètes de tous les objets que la révélation renferme, ni entendre parfaitement tout ce qu’elle nous dit. Il est très-éloigné de cette pensée. Il y a, selon lui comme selon tous ceux qui n’ont pas perdu le sens, une infinité de choses dans Dieu et dans les choses divines, que nous ne comprenons point du tout, ou que nous n’entendons que très imparfaitement. Mais il ne faut point confondre cette obscurité avec ce qu’on appelle contradiction, qui ne se trouve point dans se qui est vrai. Il ne faut pas non plus s’imaginer d’en savoir plus, que ce qui nous a été révélé;

mais se contenter de cela, sans y rien ajouter. Il y a dans les choses divines des mystères, que nous ne pénétrons jamais, et dont nous avons néanmoins des preuves assurées dans la révélation, et quelquefois même dans la raison, comme Mr. L. C. l’a fait voir dans sa Pneumatologie. Par exemple, les apôtres parlent du Messie, non seulement comme d’un homme, mais encore dans les mêmes termes que de Dieu le Père, et ils lui attribuent la création du monde; ce qui nous fait comprendre qu’ils ne l’ont nullement regardé comme un simple homme, mais comme étant uni à la Divinité, d’une manière si étroite, qu’on peut lui attribuer ce que Dieu a fait long-temps avant qu’il nâquit. Mais il n’y a personne qui puisse définir la manière de cette union et s’en forme une idée claire. Que faut-il donc faire? Acquiescer dans l’idée générale et confuse, que nous en pouvons tirer de l’Ecriture Sainte, et n’expliquer pas ce que nous ne savons point, ou imposer aux autres la nécessité de croire nos explications particulières. La raison nous apprend que Dieu a créé le monde du néant, mais il n’y a personne qui puisse savoir la manière de cette action divine.



‘ contains, or perfectly to understand all it says. He is far from  
 ‘ thinking so ; and, with all men in their senses, believes there is  
 ‘ an infinite number of things in God, and divine matters, which  
 ‘ we know nothing at all of, or understand very imperfectly. But  
 ‘ we must not confound this obscurity with what we call contradic-  
 ‘ tion, which is not to be found in any thing that is true. Nor  
 ‘ should we suppose we know more than revelation has expressed,  
 ‘ but content ourselves with that, and not presume to make addi-  
 ‘ tions. There are mysteries in divine things we shall never be able  
 ‘ to penetrate ; of which notwithstanding we have certain proofs  
 ‘ from revelation, and sometimes even from reason, as Mr. Le Clerc  
 ‘ has shewn in his Pneumatology. For example : the apostles speak  
 ‘ of the Messiah, not only as of a man, but in the very same terms as  
 ‘ of God the Father, and ascribe to him the creation of the world :  
 ‘ whence it is plain they in no wise looked on him as a man only,  
 ‘ but as united to the Divinity in so close a manner, that we may  
 ‘ truly ascribe to him those things which were done by God long  
 ‘ before he was born. But no man can define the manner of this  
 ‘ union, and form a clear idea of it. What is to be done in this  
 ‘ case ? We should acquiesce in the general obscure idea we can  
 ‘ collect from Scripture, and not go about to explain what we do  
 ‘ not understand, nor impose a necessity of believing our particular  
 ‘ explications upon other men. Reason teaches us that God created  
 ‘ the world out of nothing, but nobody can comprehend the manner  
 ‘ of that divine action.’

This may suffice in behalf of Mr. Le Clerc, though more might  
 be added from his writings : but I think nothing can be more plain  
 and express than this. By which you may observe, sir, what a  
 liberty our author takes : and I must confess, it is not without some  
 indignation I see all these learned gentlemen I have mentioned,  
 together with others, so scornfully and unhandsomely treated. And  
 when learning and piety, innocence, dignities and honours are thus  
 vilified and trampled on, who can see it unconcerned, and *withhold him-  
 self from speaking* ? Especially if we add to the rest his barbarous usage  
 of the incomparable Grotius, a man who is scarce to be equalled in  
 all his different capacities, and whose singular abilities have safely  
 placed him out of the reach of envy.

Grotius falls under Dr. Wall's displeasure<sup>t</sup>, for being guilty, as  
 he imagines, ‘ of a foul imposture, when he went about to disprove  
 ‘ the ancient practice of infant-baptism’ from St. Gregory Nazian-  
 zen's fortieth oration, which is concerning baptism ; whence he

<sup>t</sup> [Part i. p. 112.]

briskly observes, that ‘ a great stock of learning does not always ‘ cure that narrowness of soul, by which some people are inclined ‘ to do any mean and foul thing, to favour a side, or set up ‘ a party.’

It is a high imputation you will say, sir, on so great a man ; but if Grotius is really so base, it must be acknowledged he is beyond excuse, and Mr. Wall has been very kind to him ; and his learning and station should not secure him from a harsher censure : and on the other hand, if it prove a bare allegation, and not true, let his impeacher look to that, and prepare to answer it as well as he can, before that just Judge, who loves righteousness, and sees to the bottom of our most secret designs. I am tempted to believe (and what he says in another place, viz. part ii. p. 21, &c. [351, &c.] bears me out in it) that his own conscience tells him he wrongs Grotius. Perhaps he does it on purpose to have an opportunity to criticise on him, and let the world see how much he is an overmatch for him : but judge of his success by the sequel.

The words of Grotius, which Mr. Wall particularly refers to, are these<sup>u</sup> : ‘ The sense’ (viz. of a citation from Tertullian) ‘ is, let them ‘ come to CHRIST to be taught, not to be baptized, till they can ‘ understand the force of baptism. Nazianzen, speaking of such as ‘ died without baptism, instances in such as were not baptized, ‘ *διὰ νηπιότητα*, by reason of their infancy. And the same Nazian- ‘ zen himself, though a bishop’s son, and a long time trained up ‘ under his father’s care, was not baptized till he came to age, as he ‘ tells us in his own life.’

Grotius begins this annotation with observing, that the custom of baptizing infants was grounded on these words of our SAVIOUR, among others ; *Suffer little children to come unto me* : and that it appears from St. Austin, St. Cyprian, &c., to have been practised by the ancient church ; but withal remarks from Tertullian, that the precise age it was to be administered at in his time was undetermined, and left to every one’s discretion. And here immediately follow the words I have just now transcribed.

Now can it be pretended from hence, that Grotius went ‘ about ‘ here to disprove the ancient practice of infant-baptism ;’ when it is plain he first pleads for its lawfulness and antiquity, and even

<sup>u</sup> *Annot. in Matth. xix. 14.* Sensus est, veniant ad Christum ut instituantur, non ut baptizentur, nisi postquam vim baptismi intellexerint. Nazianzenus, agens de iis qui sine baptismo decedunt, exemplum ponit in iis quibus baptismus non

contigit *διὰ νηπιότητα* [ob infantiam]. Atque is ipse Nazianzenus, episcopi cum esset filius, patris sub cura diutissime educatus, baptizatus non fuit nisi cum ex ephēbis exiisset, ut ipse in vita sua nos docet. [Grotii Op. ii. p. 183.]

afterwards can mean no more than that it was not thought so indispensably necessary, but it might be deferred, if the parents pleased, to a more advanced age? And that they actually did so, he has put beyond all contradiction by the single instance of Nazianzen the elder, if he had brought no more. And Mr. Wall confesses this is all Grotius intended, when he says; ‘Grotius did not maintain ‘there was ever any church, or any time, in which infant-baptism ‘was not used.’ Pray observe how unfairly Mr. Wall deals with him. But Grotius had so expressly declared his opinion, that it was impossible he should be misunderstood; for the general conclusion he at last draws from all his arguments which oppose infant-baptism, is this\*: ‘But as all this shews the liberty, antiquity, and ‘difference of the custom, so it argues nothing at all for refusing ‘baptism to infants whom the parents offer.’ How could Mr. Wall, after reading this, say, ‘he went about to disprove infant-baptism?’ If Mr. Wall understood the Greek as well as Grotius, and had but a small share of his penetration and sincerity, he would not have taken this occasion to cavil, notwithstanding he finds so great a pleasure in it.

‘Whoever has an opinion of Grotius’ sincerity,’ Mr. Wall fancies, ‘must blush to read that passage in St. Gregory, together with his ‘annotations on Matth. xix. 14.’ But he is very much mistaken, sir; for ‘an excuse may without any difficulty be made for him,’ and need not suppose ‘he took the quotation from somebody at ‘second-hand neither,’ viz. by shewing that St. Gregory, by the phrase in dispute, at least might intend such children as chanced to miss of baptism through their parents’ fault; who being allowed to suspend it, on account of their infancy, to a later season, perhaps abused this liberty, and sometimes put it off so long, that by one means or other the children died without it. Grotius might think it reasonable to understand him thus, from St. Gregory’s way of expressing himself; for οἱ οὐδὲ εἶσιν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δέξασθαι διὰ νηπιότητα, &c., cannot admit of the fallacious turn Mr. Wall gives it, but must be rendered, ‘who are not in a capacity to receive it,’ or ‘cannot receive it, because of their infancy.’ For I never yet observed, nor I believe better Grecians than Mr. Wall and myself, that εἶναι ἐν δυνάμει signifies ‘to have in one’s power:’ and because I would not rely on my own knowledge too much, I consulted Stephens, who was utterly ignorant also of this new construction;

\* *Annot. in Matth. xix. 14.* Cæterum ista, sicut libertatem, vetustatem, et consuetudinis differentiam indicant, ita nihil

afferunt cur repudiandus sit baptismus infantium, quos parentes, &c., consecrandos offerunt.

he has the Greek phrase exactly, and translates it as I have done. And one would have thought, Epictetus's celebrated distinction of 'things which are, and are not in our own power,' might have taught Mr. Wall how that sense is to be expressed in Greek. Besides, Grotius was too able a man to commit so gross an error; and it seems more probable that he took St. Gregory right, if you consider (which Grotius must certainly know, and Mr. Wall confesses) that it was common at that time for people, for some reason or other, to let their children go without baptism many years: and even in the oration before us St. Gregory advises people to delay their children's baptism, 'till they are capable to hear and answer some of the holy words,' as our author translates the passage. All which considerations make it almost necessary to understand the passage as Grotius did, who therefore cannot be thought guilty of such a base design as our author charges on him. And therefore, to use something better than his own logic, I will not say 'a great stock of learning,' but I find a great stock of assurance is not always an infallible sign that an author is not enslaved to 'that narrowness of soul, by which some people are inclined to do any mean and foul thing, to favour a side, or make a figure in a party.'

What Mr. Wall objects against Grotius, in relation to the Neocæsarean council, may be easily answered likewise, by comparing, with but moderate attention, what he and they have writ. According to our author's own representation of it, any one who goes about it with ever so good a will, must find it difficult to see wherein Grotius is to be blamed. As to the words of the council, Mr. Wall acknowledges they are so ambiguous in themselves, that they may be fairly understood in favour of either party. And as to the last clause, which is the principal ground of the controversy, he cannot deny but Balsamon, who was patriarch of Antioch, and Zonaras, who had been secretary to the emperor Alexis Comnenus, both of them Grecians and learned men, did understand it in the sense Grotius cites them to confirm: now upon these concessions, I defy Rivet, Marshall, and Mr. Wall himself, to fasten any thing upon Grotius like foul dealing in the matter. And pray mind, sir, how Mr. Wall, though he knows these three famous men were unexceptionable judges in the Greek tongue, and expounded the words in the sense he believes is not the true, forgetting what he had owned before, pleasantly affirms they do it contrary to the 'rules of critics;' and 'that any critic will observe,' the peculiar 'notation of the word



‘*ἴδιος*’ determines his sense only to be true. Is it not very strange that it should be so plain and obvious for ‘any critic’ to observe, and yet these three, and indeed all others but himself, who to be sure must be no critics of course, had not the wit to see it, no more than he had to avoid the absurdity of saying, the words of the canon may be well enough understood either way, and yet that the nature and idiom of the Greek language shew they can be fairly understood but in one sense, viz. his own.

Though he would insinuate indeed, that ‘the opinions of Balsamon and Zonaras are but of little moment,’ which by the way is a certain sign they are against him, I hope they will appear otherwise, and far superior to his detractions and criticisms. The words of Zonaras are such downright mere antipædobaptism, expressed so fully, without reserve, that I wonder Mr. Wall had the courage to insert them so largely. But his translation of them might have been more exact: for what he unintelligibly renders, I believe from the Latin translator whom he mistakes, ‘For,’ says it, (viz. the canon,) ‘every one’s own choice is requisite that they do profess themselves followers of Christ, and it appears by that baptism which they receive with a willing mind,’ (which words I cannot find have any sense,) should be Englished thus, (to vary from him as little as possible,) ‘It says, in the profession of becoming followers of Christ, every one’s choice is required, and by this it appears whether they come to holy baptism with a willing mind.’ The truth of what I say will appear from the original, if you will please to compare it, which Mr. Wall has omitted, I suppose, that his sense might pass the better.

Balsamon is as direct to the same purpose; for, assigning another reason why the unborn child could not be thought baptized in the mother’s baptism, besides this, ‘that the woman has nothing common in the matter of baptism with the child in her womb;’ he adds, ‘They’ (viz. the Fathers of the council) ‘say, every person’s own profession is necessary at baptism; but now the child unborn, being void of all sense, cannot make the professions which are to be made at baptism.’ For thus I think the sense better expressed, than as Mr. Wall has rendered the passage.

It appears from the whole, that Grotius cited these passages very properly; and they prove at least that ignorance and want of desire were a good reason against baptizing such as were not able to make and declare their choice: and both these commentators, expressing this so amply, have made it probable, that such children at that time were not, or however, according to them, needed not be bap-

tized, especially if there was no apparent danger of their dying. Any one who shall read over their comments with an unbiassed mind, will see the writers were as much for the liberty and indifference of pædobaptism, as either of the Gregorys and Tertullian is supposed to have been; otherwise their arguing is unaccountably absurd. But I cannot tell how to think two such men, and according to their interpretation the whole council too, should make use of what Mr. Wall calls such *leaden-headed logic*.

I own Balsamon, or perhaps somebody else, has subjoined, at the end of his comment, some words which allow children may be brought to baptism by sponsors: the place is a little obscure, and I cannot be positive of the perfect sense of it; but it does not seem at all to do our author the service he is willing to believe it does. *Κατατίθενται*, in the latter clause, should not be translated so readily by *promise*; for the profession required at baptism is expressed every where else in these citations by *ὁμολογία* and *ὁμολογεῖν*. But let this be as it will; if Balsamon does here countenance infant-baptism, it is no more than what I have shewn Grotius did too: and therefore these words should not be urged against him, since they are consistent enough with the *liberty* and *indifference* he pleads for.

Mr. Wall endeavours to strengthen his supposition, from the dispute between St. Austin and Pelagius. But this will do him no service, if you consider their dispute was not, whether infants should be baptized or no, but for what end they were baptized: and he should not have said, ‘they do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that were against infant-baptism;’ but, which had been truer, that Pelagius did not contradict St. Austin, when he declared he never heard of any that denied baptism was given ‘for remission of sins,’ as perhaps I may have occasion to shew hereafter.

I beg leave now to apply what is said above more closely to my design; by remarking, that a man who is so free with persons in such reputation, will take a much greater liberty, it is to be suspected, with the poor despised antipædobaptists; and I desire therefore you will be pleased to read him with diffidence and circumspection.

Nor indeed has he by abundance acted the part of a credible historian towards us; though he makes a show of treating us with extraordinary tenderness and respect. But it is all assumed and hollow, and may be easily seen through; and he conveys his aspersions the more securely by it, and with less suspicion stabs our reputation. He carefully affects to style us antipædobaptists quite

through his book, because forsooth he would avoid casting any reflections on us; but he could not forbear discovering how uneasy he is at the restraint he laid on himself: and so, after he has painted anabaptism in no very pleasing colours, he as carefully lets you know<sup>y</sup>, sir, we deserve that reproachful name, though, since we disown it, he has not given it us.

I remember three several places, where he is so incautious as to confess he is in a very willing humour to believe and suppose any thing, though upon no ground, so it does but favour his design: so when he finds Bilius had said, 'persons came later to baptism in the 'primitive times than nowadays,' which is most directly to deny infant-baptism was practised in the primitive church; Mr. Wall is so hard put to it, he can only relieve himself by resolving<sup>z</sup> to 'believe, if one were to look over Bilius' writings, one should find 'that this was not his settled opinion.' He has the same dexterity in other places, where he says, 'All I believe this learned man would 'say (for I have not the book),' &c., and 'so, for aught I know, do 'all the rest of the eastern,' &c., a sign he is powerfully inclined to fancy what he pleases should be true. How often he uses this notable expedient, is not readily discovered; but it is very reasonably inferred, from these open confessions, he employs it where he is not so kind as to give us warning.

He builds on this sort of arguments, when he would reproach us with something he has no other evidence for; as may be seen by several passages in his account of 'the present state of the antipædo-' 'baptists in England:' and of a piece with it is his so easily receiving and officiously reporting every uncertain rumour that had reached his ears. If he has but heard that any one, or a few persons at most, who called themselves, or were called by others, *anabaptists*, have ever maintained or practised such things, as may enrage people against us, and expose us to the scorn and fury of the less thinking bigoted part of those from whom we dissent, he does not forget it. Thus he insinuates<sup>a</sup>, that we countenance, at least, and have among us, some who deny the human nature of our Lord Christ. This at best is spitefully enough represented: but I protest, for my part, I do not know there is so much as a single man in our body who dares impiously deny so great a fundamental of the Christian faith. We are sure such an one can be no Christian; and if there be any such, we disown them all, and their pernicious heresy, which we are firmly persuaded aims at no less than the utter destruction of Christ-

<sup>y</sup> Part ii. p. 99. [420.]

<sup>z</sup> Part ii. p. 20. [349.]

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. p. 223. [540.]

ianity itself. As invidious is his relating the scandalous story about Mr. Hicks: which, were it as true as it is false, has been equalled and outdone by some of our author's communion: and therefore notwithstanding this, we may still be reckoned as loyal to the government as themselves. But since he is forced to confess that no more than 'two persons only appeared to have been guilty,' he ought in honour, and in respect to the oaths of those of his own party, to have left the scandal in the obscurity it deserves, &c.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

JOHN GALE.

---

## LETTER II.

THE private opinions of a few not justly inserted in the history of the whole body—There are probably ill men among us, as well as among others—Some of our author's invidious insinuations—Our adversaries, instead of railing, should endeavour to convince us from revelation, or reason, or antiquity—If their reflections were true, our reputation cannot suffer much—We are not guilty of the hated opinions Mr. Wall loads us with—Our separation easy to be justified—Mr. Wall has not sufficiently shewn wherein the sin of schism consists—He only explains it in general by division, separation, &c.—The true notion of schism—It may either be lawful or unlawful—Who are schismatics—Not they who go out from a communion they were before joined with, but those who unnecessarily give or take the occasion; or continue separate without a just cause—It being lawful in some cases, and unlawful in others to separate, it is examined what will justify a separation—Mr. Wall's distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, though good in itself, is insufficient, unless he had determined what are fundamentals and what are not—A rule to know these—Christ alone can determine what is necessary; and what he has not expressly made so, is not so—It is useful to distinguish between things necessary to salvation, and things only necessary to the constitution of a true gospel-church—This distinction well-grounded, because the qualifications of a Christian and a church are very different—An error in what is essential to the constitution of a church only, a sufficient warrant to separate from a community in such error—Which is also confirmed from some of Mr. Wall's own words—Agreement in the fundamentals of religion not a sufficient reason against separation, as Mr. Wall would urge it—Turned against himself—Therefore his arguments tend to nothing so much as confusion—Though it should be allowed, that we ought to submit all things purely indifferent to the determinations of our superiors; this would make but very little, if at all, in Mr. Wall's favour—It does not follow that persons, who think they ought not to renounce communion for smaller matters, must therefore constantly conform in those things, and neglect what they think is better—If the ceremonies are not of so much consequence, as to justify the dissenters in their separation; neither will they justify the church in so unnecessarily insisting on



them—These things, said to be indifferent in themselves, by being the occasions of divisions, cease to be indifferent, and become unlawful—The dissenters are verily persuaded the things for which they dissent, are not so indifferent as is pretended—The Church's power of making laws for its own government, of no service to Mr. Wall—Things in themselves lawful may be so circumstantiated, as to become unlawful—As the case stands at present, the dissenters are obliged to dissent from the national church—The uncharitable obstinacy of our adversaries—The separation of the antipædobaptists particularly defended—Mr. Wall pretends that though they are right, they have no ground to separate—The antipædobaptist notion stated—The time and manner of receiving baptism, so far as it relates to our present dispute, are fundamentals—That cannot be true baptism, which differs from true baptism—Our separation justified by the definition of a church, in the nineteenth article of the church of England—We ought not to unite with persons unbaptized—True baptism necessary to Church membership—The words of the institution the best rule by which to judge what is true baptism—We refuse to communicate with the church of England, for the same reason for which she refuses to communicate with persons she esteems unbaptized—Mr. Wall's terms of union very partial and unreasonable—We are obliged to the Toleration for the general forbearance Mr. Wall boasts of—And desire to remain in the hands of her Majesty and parliaments under God, who have hitherto so kindly secured us—A fair proposal, in order to establish unity among us—Mr. Wall a friend to persecutions for religion—The conclusion.

SIR,

WHAT I have already said in my former, instead of more, may serve for a specimen of Mr. Wall's moderation and ingenuity. What can be more unfair, than to represent and judge of a whole body by the odd, singular opinions of a few particular men in it? Mr. Wall, and all men, would justly esteem him an abusive historian, who, reciting the doctrines of the Church of England, should charge her with the miserable absurdity of the Church of Rome, transubstantiation, only because bishop Bramhall says, 'No genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny the true real presence;' or the gainful article of purgatory, because Mr. Dodwell<sup>b</sup> has unaccountably asserted—and cited the Liturgies published by primate Ussher to prove—that the dead, not excepting 'the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and even the blessed Virgin herself, are now in slavery to the Devil;' and adding in the next page, that by this slavery he does not mean they are liable to any punishments, but only certain molestations and inquietudes, from which they 'may be relieved by the prayers of the livinge.' Had Bellarmine been

<sup>b</sup> Epistolary Discourse, p. 258.

<sup>c</sup> Epistolary Discourse, p. 259. [Mr. Dodwell, however, does not assert that

the persons spoken of *may* be relieved, as if such were his own opinion. His words are, 'some inquietudes, wherein they

to argue this notion of a purgatory with Mr. Dodwell, he would have desired no greater concessions.

That man would be justly blamed, who should pretend the Church of England teaches Christ's sacrifice of himself was not expiatory for sin, or that the martyrs are capable of making the like expiation; because Mr. Dodwell in another place<sup>d</sup> ventures at the extravagant assertion, that 'this power and virtue is common to Christ and his mystical body;' speaking more particularly of the primitive martyrs making their blood almost equally effectual with Christ's to the purging away sin; and accounting them so many expiatory sacrifices for sin; directly contrary to the determination of the holy penman, that Christ, (Heb. ix. 26.) *once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* (Cap. x. 10.) *Which was offered once for all.* (Ver. 12.) *One sacrifice for sin for ever.* (Ver. 14.) *For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.* (Ver. 18.) And, *There is no more offering for sin.*

It would be shameful injustice to make the church answerable for all the strange, nay sometimes blasphemous and atheistical fancies, and bad actions of her pretended sons. Too great a part of the clergy, it is notorious, are either open non-juring jacobites, or secret, and therefore more mischievous, highflyers; entirely in the Pretender's interest, and as hearty friends to popish tyranny and superstition, as ever was the Laudean faction. What a number is there of them, who glory in being called high-church-men, and carefully keep up the distinction, notwithstanding the queen and parliament have often declared such to be dangerous enemies to church and state! But to ascribe the disloyalties, corruptions, and pernicious doctrines of these men to the church, though they have had the fortune to worm themselves into some share of her dignities, would be disingenuous, and every honest man would abhor it.

Of the twelve our Lord had chosen, one was a devil; and I shall never pretend no such have crept in among us, who, whether designedly or no, prejudice those they shelter with, and the Christian religion in general. Undoubtedly there are privately among us, as well as others, weak and ignorant, and perhaps too, some ill-meaning people, who are fond of peculiar conceits, and idle extravagant notions of their own framing. But this can be no fair objection to the whole body; for let any one shew me the com-

<sup>a</sup> *might be relieved by the prayers of the living according to the opinion of S. Justin Martyr.* Surely this is an imperfect and unfair quotation.]

<sup>d</sup> Dissertat. Cyprianic. xiii. § 36. Et vero nominis ratio suadet potius ut sit virtus hæc CHRISTO cum ejusdem mystico corpore communis.

munity whose individuals are all correct and sound, and not some of them singular and faulty; which however are but as the wens and unnatural excrescences in the human body, which enter not into the description of the body, but at most are only counted accidental irregularities it is liable to.

When Mr. Wall, therefore, in order to make us look the more monstrous, shuffles into his impartial account, as he calls it, of our present opinions, the freaks and persuasions he has heard a single man, or a very few persons that have been in our party, maintain; it looks very pitiful in him, and can impose only on such readers who are as willing to be deceived as he desired. And indeed such readers only can bear his many mischievous insinuations; a sort of ornament he seems fond of. I cannot comprehend what could possibly be his design in his silly excuse for Mr. Baxter, who continued to charge us with a notorious falsehood, even after all proper care was taken to let him know it; nor what occasion he had for his innuendo, when he briefly mentions our liberality to our poor; adding in an invidious parenthesis, that we attract the multitude by this artifice, and gain proselytes to strengthen our party. I wonder in my heart what he thinks it is that attracts the rich; for unless there are such, the poor are not like to be provided for: is it that they seek opportunities to dispense of their good things to the necessitous and wretched? I am afraid this would be too great a commendation of them; and Mr. Wall would not willingly be guilty of such a supposition; he rather seems desirous to have it supposed they are acted only by an unquiet, factious spirit; for what else can be his meaning in saying, ‘They, ‘either out of peevishness, or else being over-persuaded by their ‘leaders, who find their account in continuing separate bodies, whereof ‘they may be heads, do refuse to join even in those things wherein ‘they agree in opinion with us<sup>e</sup>?

Why also does he so often upbraid us with having had Jesuits found among us, and take the pains so industriously<sup>f</sup> to aggravate the thing, unless to make us thought a troublesome, factious party, and the tools of disaffected men to divide and weaken the protestant interest? But such clamours only shew passion and distaste in our opposers, and are no demonstration they have either truth or justice on their side, and that we are in the error. If these zealous men would effectually ruin our cause, they should leave railing, and use their strength to convince us from Revelation, or the principles of reason, or the history of the primitive church, that we are the vile,

<sup>e</sup> Part i. p. 96. [127.]

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. p. 282. [562.]

novel, and humorous sect they abusively pretend. We invite them to the trial, and are not apprehensive of being worsted in the issue; for we bottom our cause on the stable foundation of Scripture, reason, and primitive practice. Does it not look as if they were conscious that they can do us no hurt from these topics, by their forsaking these arguments, and endeavouring to oppress us by more popular arts? as if they thought one of the most prevailing arguments against us is, publishing and persuading people to believe that our leaders are Romish priests, or persons who are their retainers, and do them service. And they usually ply us hard with these reflections. Nothing can be more exemplary in this kind, than the heroic exploits of Featly, Baxter, and Russen, to mention no more.

But as we have already, so we shall see further, as we proceed, that Mr. Wall's fidelity in relations of this nature, is not altogether so much to be trusted to, but we may fairly question the facts: besides, were these things true, our reputation cannot suffer much; for every one must needs be sensible, it is impossible always to be aware of those busy intruders, who wear any shape, and choose to mix in societies they think dangerous to their designs, to breed corruptions and disorders there, and then get themselves discovered, in order to lay the whole disgrace on the societies, and make them bear the scandal. And Mr. Wall might have considered, that even the national church has not been free from such maskers, who have found means to open themselves a way to her preferments and profits. I need bring no other testimony sure of this, than a speech made in parliament, February 9, 1640, by the great lord Falkland, a true friend of the church, according to the character given him by our late noble English Thucydides<sup>h</sup>, who was himself too as firm a patron of the church as by law established, as any in his time; and that noble lord's complaint, therefore, cannot be judged to come from envy or detraction.

But lest all this should not be effectual to expose us so much as he could wish, to shew his real tenderness towards us, he loads us further with some of the most infamous and hated opinions, which the generality of Christians disown, and the warm and eager anathematize with the greatest fury. And this addition, perhaps, he thinks will weigh down our scale.

If, indeed, the things he taxes us with were true, I would be silent on the point: but they are so notoriously false, that I admire any man, especially one of Mr. Wall's order, could persuade himself

<sup>g</sup> Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 184.

<sup>h</sup> Lord Clarendon.



to accuse us of them. Socinianism is one of the blackest heretical tenets, with most people, that infests the Christian world; it is commonly thought so derogatory to our Redeemer's honour, and so inconsistent with the fundamentals of Christianity, that all its abettors may be justly treated like infidels, and open enemies of God and religion. This, Mr. Wall knows, is much the more prevailing temper, as well as it seems to be his own. And therefore, to expose us to a general contempt, and to draw this odium upon us, he takes care to inform you, that 'we have many Socinians among us,' insinuating as if we countenanced them; and that 'the old heretics<sup>k</sup>, 'some of them denied him (viz. Christ) to be God; and others of 'them denied him to be properly man: but these,' says he, 'deny 'both, and say, he is neither God nor properly man.'

It is strange any one should have the face so boldly to affirm this, when himself, and all that are acquainted with us, know it to be utterly false. There are such, I know, in the Church of England, though she deservedly disclaims them; and there may secretly be some with us; and so in all parties: but they are so uncommon, or so concealed, that I do not know so much as one among us. And I need only appeal to our author himself, to justify us from his own calumny; for at another time, when he is not in quite so ill an humour, he confesses, that though we 'have some Socinians who 'creep in among us, yet I have not heard,' says he, 'of any church 'or congregation of them, that makes profession of that doctrine; 'but on the contrary, that they that profess it openly are rejected 'from their communion!'. And pray, what can we or any church in the world, do more to cleanse ourselves of that leprosy? and yet he could suffer himself to accuse us of holding those very opinions, he here owns we endeavour to root out. Can this, sir, and the other things I have been noting, flow from an honest, good mind?

I would omit other mistakes, &c. of Mr. Wall, as his charging Pelagianism, and holding the 'mortality of the soul,' upon us; which are very falsely imputed, in order to come to the grand question between us: but what he says of the non-necessity and unreasonableness of our separation must not be passed over without a reflection, it seeming to be designed to render us odious, by insinuating, how much our censorious quarrelsome spirit delights in fractions and divisions.

The necessity and reasonableness of a separation from the established church, you know, sir, have been copiously treated by several eminent men; and I think it no hard matter to vindicate ours

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. p. 222. [539.]<sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 265. [541.]<sup>l</sup> Ibid. p. 275. [555.]

from the strongest objections raised against it: but this is not the place; I shall therefore only make a short reply to what Mr. Wall urges, because his representation of the thing may possibly too much have its designed effect, and do us a prejudice with yourself, sir, or others, into whose hands these letters may fall.

Mr. Wall begins his last chapter<sup>m</sup>, which he calls a *dissuasive from separation*, with an account of the great sin and mischief of schism, which, he observes, all men allow to be of a very heinous nature; and he ought in charity therefore to suppose all men as solicitous to avoid the guilt of it as himself; and kindly in assisting them to *flee from the wrath which is to come*, he should not only warn them of the evils it produces, which they are already convinced of, but plainly shew wherein the sin consists, that they may shun it the better. He has not done this distinctly enough, but constantly exclaims against schism, without ever giving the true notion of it, and proving particularly what it is, which was the business of the chapter. Had he cleared up this, and then convicted us of it, he had triumphed, and we would have immediately put an end to our separation.

Instead of this, he only explains it in general, by ‘division, separation, and breaking the unity;’ and, to make all separatists from himself as black as may be<sup>n</sup>, would have this separation in general believed no better than what St. Paul calls *heresy*. And yet certainly he would not have us understand all divisions, &c. are culpable schisms; for he supposes it lawful to separate on account of difference in fundamentals, though even then (which looks like a contradiction) there is<sup>o</sup> a sin, he seems to say, in the separation. So that he leaves the thing very obscure, and, by some passages, seems to think *he* may lawfully separate from all who do not agree with him; but they, on the other hand, cannot forsake him without a great sin. Hence you see, sir, how necessary it was to fix the right notion of schism, if our author had intended his *dissuasive* should have had any success.

Briefly to supply this defect; though *σχίσμα*, you know, sir, signifies literally a bare *rent* or *division*, yet in the ecclesiastical sense it either relates to the dissensions among the members of the same particular church, as 1 Cor. xi. 18, or more commonly, as also in our present dispute, it is used for a needless and unjust occasioning the body of Christ’s church, which is but one, to be torn into different communities. It is not so much the actual separating, as the unjustly causing it, is the sin. Schism, in the large sense of

<sup>m</sup> Part ii. p. 382. [657.]

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. p. 383. [658.]

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. p. 399. l. 4. [669, &c.]

the word, may be lawful or unlawful, as it is applied to one or the other party; for the division or separation is mutual, and relates equally to both sides that disagree. Now Mr. Wall uses the word indeterminately; and, which renders what he says perplexed, confounds the different meanings of it.

That we may proceed more clearly, I intend by schismatics such as unnecessarily cause divisions, and by schism the great sin such are guilty of. In this sense only schism is to be condemned as unlawful; and thus St. Paul, by a periphrasis, calls schismatics not separatists barely, but *such as cause divisions*<sup>p</sup>. This I take to be the peculiar and proper import of the word, as it has been, and is now used in the church.

Hence it follows, that not so much they who go out from a communion they were joined with before, are the schismatics, as those who rashly and unjustly either give or take occasion so to separate. Thus if the church of Rome, by her idolatries and other corruptions, makes it just and necessary to divide from her, she commits the schism or separation, by rendering the terms of communion so unsafe and impracticable; and not our forefathers, who wisely followed the apostle's counsel, to *come out from among them*<sup>q</sup>.

In like manner, if any church through length of time, and the presumptions and mismanagement of her governors, degenerate into dangerous errors and corruptions, and a few persons observing it make proper application to have them redressed, and no care is taken upon it: those few wiser and more conscientious not only lawfully may, but are indispensably bound to renounce the communion of such unreasonable bigots. The other side, though, as it generally happens, by far the majority, are the schismatics, in adhering so obstinately to their corruptions, which are incompatible with the purity of a church of Christ, and refusing to join with the others in a reformation of those abuses, and endeavouring to reduce themselves to a nearer conformity with the primitive church.

The case will be much the same in regard to those who never were in union, if they continue separated upon insufficient grounds from a society, which, if compared, has more properties of a church than themselves. This is formal schism; which, as I said, is being separate and divided, without just cause, from a true church. And this will make it difficult for several members the Church of England is troubled with, to clear themselves from the guilt of schism, in acknowledging that at Rome for a true church, and yet separating from her: if they are separated, and not, as many suspect, her real

<sup>p</sup> Rom. xvi. 17.

<sup>q</sup> 2 Cor. vi. 17.

friends, and reconciled to her in their heart; though for designs best known to themselves, they affect to appear otherwise, and so reproach her with schism underhand, in such manner as may not expose them to her censure.

To return: by what has been said, the matter is brought to this issue, that those who unjustly give occasion to separate from the true church, and those who unjustly take it, with such also as continue ununited without sufficient cause, are alone schismatics in the Scripture-sense, which is the right; and are therefore fairly reckoned enemies of the cross and catholic church of Christ.

But now, since it is lawful in some circumstances to renounce communion, and sinful in others, it concerns us to examine what those circumstances are, which may make separation schismatical or not; and indeed here the main difficulty lies.

Mr. Wall offers to explain it, by distinguishing between fundamental points, and such as are not of the foundation. ‘An error in ‘the fundamentals of religion,’ he says<sup>r</sup>, ‘does put a bar to our ‘communion with those that teach it.’ But for mistakes in matters of less moment, he thinks we have St. Paul’s direction and order *to bear with one another*, and receive one another into communion notwithstanding those differences; which indeed it must be allowed are not sufficient to warrant so desperate a remedy as separation. But this distinction, though good in itself, will however do little service in the case before us, because we are still to determine which are fundamentals, and which are not; and I do not remember Mr. Wall has touched upon this; nevertheless, I observe, he has made some articles so, which I, and thousands besides, can by no means grant him. I will not single them out, because they signify little to our present dispute; but I mentioned the thing in gross, to shew how requisite it was for him to have taken some care to settle this matter.

The subject is too large for me to handle it thoroughly: I shall therefore satisfy myself with laying down but one rule, which I believe will not be controverted, and perhaps might easily be shewn to be a very certain universal guide to direct us at all times to distinguish things necessary and essential from useful only. Not all things plainly contained in the Scriptures, as some express themselves too generally, but ‘such alone as explicitly, or by very plain ‘consequence, so as all men, even the most ignorant and simple, by ‘fairly reading and considering, may discern them to be declared

<sup>r</sup> Part ii. p. 385. [659. ‘False doctrines in the fundamentals,’ &c. are Dr. Wall’s words.]



‘ necessary in the Scripture, which is our only infallible guide on earth; are all the fundamental and necessary articles of the Christian church and faith.’ To illustrate it by an example; it is said directly, that *after they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives*; and, in another place, that *Saul was consenting to Stephen’s death*: neither of which is a necessary article that will endanger a man’s salvation who questions it, or is ignorant of it, or, if it could be supposed, should misunderstand it. But when the Lord says, *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent*; and again, *Unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no part in me*; and, *without faith it is impossible to please God*: none can be so blind as not to see that these, and many other such passages, are points absolutely necessary to salvation under the Gospel.

Our Lord, and he only, can teach us what things he indispensably requires of all to whom his Gospel is preached; and we having no way to know his will but by searching the Scriptures, it cannot be questioned but their authority must be enough to determine the things, which really are and ought to be accounted necessary or not necessary by us; for no power can alter what our Lord has there established.

It will be convenient here, to distinguish between things necessary only to salvation, and those which are necessary to the rightful constitution of a true Gospel-church: for these are far from being one and the same. It would be needless to go about to shew that this distinction is well grounded; but Mr. Wall seeming not apprised of it, or not to own it, I will venture to say something to confirm it.

In order to this it may be observed, the qualifications which make a true Christian, and which constitute a true church, are different. The fundamentals of Christianity may be found in a single man, but a single man cannot have all the essentials of a church: and further, a body of men may be good Christians, orthodox in all fundamentals, and yet not able to form themselves into a church. It is necessary indeed that church-members be true Christians, and free from fundamental errors; but this alone does not constitute them a church, which is not only a body of faithful men and women, but they must be united together in Christ’s name, so as that among them may be orderly performed the several duties required in a Christian church.

Thus the parliament for instance, and all our other civil societies, we will charitably suppose, are good Christians, that hold the truth

in all godliness and honesty ; yet nobody sure can pretend, when they are assembled in their houses under their speakers, their sole heads as parliaments, they are then a rightly constituted church, where the ecclesiastical offices may be legally executed. So that though persons may hold all the necessary articles of Christian religion, by which they are, according to the new covenant in Christ's blood, entitled to salvation ; yet on some other accounts they cannot be thought to constitute a true church.

The consequence therefore is unavoidable, that the fundamentals of Christian religion, and a Christian church, are not altogether the same ; and I think it is proved also from the authority of the Church of England, which makes the due administration of the sacraments essential to the being of a true church, and yet charitably grants that of Rome to be in a salvable state ; though for some reasons their salvation cannot but be thought very hazardous, and must be *so as by fire*.

One of the necessary qualities of a true church is, the edification of the members, which is our Lord's great end in founding churches on earth. If therefore all other necessities are retained, and by superstitiously adding some things, and presumptuously altering others, the conversion of sinners, and the edification of believers, is not promoted but hindered, that church cannot be counted a true one.

Again : to mistake in the notion of a church, and deny there ought to be an order of persons lawfully ordained and set apart for the altar, to preach the pure word of God, and administer the sacraments, is an error we may fall into, without endangering our salvation, or the foundations of Christian religion.

If the divine right of episcopacy be questioned, and the non-juring bishops rejected by the more judicious part of the Church of England, and the chimæra of uninterrupted succession given up, though we should suppose them in the wrong and Mr. Dodwell in the right, he was certainly much too hasty in charging the present Church of England with schism and heresy too : for though those things should destroy the being of a true church, they do not endanger a man's salvation : so that I infer from the principles of these rigid highflyers, who disown the present constitution, and account themselves another church, different from that by law established, which they openly call schismatical and heretical, that all the essentials of a church are not necessary to salvation. But on the other hand, you are to observe, sir, though to be right in the essentials of a church is not a fundamental of religion ; yet to be right

in the fundamentals of religion, is a necessary article of a true church; the fundamentals of a church including the necessary articles of Christianity, but not *vice versa*. I speak of a particular visible church, not of the universal invisible one, which, perhaps, has no other essentials than the necessary articles of the Christian religion; for every true Christian is a member of the catholic church, though he should happen not to be in communion with any visible one. Is there not an apparent distinction now between things necessary to make a true Christian, and to make a true church? The first must be in every member, but the others can be in the aggregate or body only.

It was not enough then for Mr. Wall to say, in general, that a difference in fundamentals is a sufficient ground of separation, because it still remains a question, whether both kinds of fundamentals justify it? and if not, which sort can do it? By the tenor of the chapter, he seems to mean the fundamentals of religion only, taking no notice of the others; but it may be asked, whether an error in what relates to the fundamental constitution of a church only, will not warrant a separation from a church in such an error? One would think this could not possibly be denied; for let the necessary qualifications, essential to the very being of a church, be what they will, if they are any of them wanting in a community, of consequence there can be no church; and we not only may, but ought to withdraw ourselves from it; for it is only schism to separate from a true church, and not from one so corrupted.

For instance; if a civil society, which we will suppose to be perfectly right in all the fundamentals of religion, should at any time presume to call themselves a true church of Christ, and accordingly, without the proper qualifications, assume the sacred offices, and administer the holy sacraments; I am no way obliged to unite with them, or if already united, to continue so; but on the contrary, to come out from them, and disown their presumption.

We see from hence it is commendable in us to separate from any body of men, though perfectly orthodox in the substantial articles of our most holy religion, merely on account of their errors in things which relate to the fundamental constitution of a church. And though Mr. Wall, as I said, does not mention this distinction, or perhaps may not be willing to admit it; yet I have just recollected a passage, where, in effect, he acknowledges all I have said. After he has enumerated some (for I suppose he does not pretend them to be all) 'fundamental articles of our faith,' on account of errors in which a separation is on all hands allowed lawful, he adds, 'But

‘ there are, besides those that hold such doctrines pernicious to the  
‘ foundation, abundance of Christians that hold the same faith in  
‘ all fundamental points, who do yet live in divisions and separation,  
‘ disowning and renouncing one another’s communion. It is pity  
‘ but these should be reduced to the unity which Christ’s body  
‘ requires<sup>s</sup>.’

In these words he plainly supposes a society may hold ‘ the same  
‘ faith’ in all ‘ fundamental points,’ as he grants at least some of the  
dissenters do, and yet not have power to constitute a true church ;  
for if they were so, they would be the same church and body of  
Christ, and no more divided than the particular bodies of the Church  
of England are ; but he denies this to the dissenters, by his blaming  
their conduct in the matter.

By this passage also it appears our author can not only allow it  
lawful in some cases, but even urge it as a duty, to separate from a  
community which calls itself a church, and holds ‘ all the funda-  
‘ mental points of faith,’ solely on account of some other things, in  
which he supposes it defective. Now, if this society is a true  
church, Mr. Wall will not pretend it is a duty to separate from such  
an one. By advising the members of that society, therefore, to  
leave it, and unite themselves to the Church of England, he implies,  
there are some other things necessary to the constitution of a true  
church, besides orthodoxy in fundamental articles of faith ; and  
plainly enough asserts, that we ought every one to renounce such a  
communion, while destitute of those necessary things, whatever  
they be.

If it is lawful then to separate from such Christians as we agree  
with in fundamentals of faith, it is strange our author should make  
this same agreement his only reason against a separation, as you see  
he does in the words cited, as well as in several other places. Since  
‘ they hold all the fundamental points,’ he says, they ought to  
unite, and not separate ; and yet, those who ‘ hold all the funda-  
‘ mental points,’ lawfully may, and are sometimes bound in duty to  
separate from one another. This looks like something of an ab-  
surdity, not easy to be reconciled, and which unwary men only can  
be guilty of. I believe it would puzzle you, sir, to guess his  
meaning, unless it be, that none may lawfully separate from the  
Church of England that hold the ‘ same faith in all ‘ fundamental  
‘ points,’ because he is of that church ; and the dissenters are obliged  
to leave their churches, whereof our author is not a member, though  
agreeing in the same faith in all fundamental points, and join

<sup>s</sup> Part ii. p. 386. [661.]



themselves to his communion. But I am inclined to believe our author will have the mortification to see, notwithstanding the great authority he assumes, that few, if any, will lay so much stress on his example, as merely on account of that, or any thing he has written, so easily to forsake their own churches, and fondly join themselves to his.

But, besides the fallacy of this argument, it turns as strongly upon himself, and the church whereof he is a member; for let us put the reverse, and say, (which is true,) the Church of England is separate from and disowns the dissenters, as well as the dissenters are separate from her: and if agreement in the fundamental articles of faith alone, according to Mr. Wall, is sufficient to render separation unlawful; I ask, on this supposition, whether it is not as much the duty of the church, as of the dissenters, to end the separation by conforming?

I cannot, I confess, see but both sides are equally affected with the argument; for if it is incumbent on all in general to unite to those they agree with in the fundamentals of faith, without respecting any thing else; the obligation is as binding on the church to conform to the dissenters, as it can be on the dissenters to conform to the church.

And if so, to what purpose then does our author insist so much on this single topic, which, if it does any thing, is as full against the church he undertakes to defend, as against any other that holds the same fundamentals in faith?

The reasoning of this chapter, therefore, (though I am far from thinking it his design,) if justly pursued, would produce confusion and obstinacy rather than any thing else. For it makes it necessary for the dissenters to alter their own constitution, and receive that of the Church of England; which is obliged at the same time, and for the same reason, to quit her constitution, and receive that of the dissenters: and when this is done, the separation will continue still as wide as before, and they must change back again, and so go on in a constant round; unless to fix the matter, one side shall sinfully resolve to adhere to their old form, in order to afford the other a possibility of knowing and performing their duty. But it would be endless to trace this winding maze of numerous absurdities quite through. Mr. Wall indeed thinks there is a great disparity between the Church of England and the dissenters, and therefore the argument does not oblige both alike.

They agree, it is true, in all fundamentals of religion; and the difference between them is, in his opinion, concerning things of far

less moment, and in which that church has signally the advantage, in that she is established by the civil authority of the land; and therefore in all things of an indifferent nature ought to have the preference, and be obeyed: and the dissenters, not standing on the same foot, ought to submit all such things, and acquiesce in her determinations.

Supposing this, and that nothing can be more just and reasonable than in things purely indifferent to be regulated by our superiors; Mr. Wall must take this along with him as the consequence, that if any of the dissenting parties should become the national church by the civil power, they would have a right to the same privileges; for what the magistrate's establishment gives to one, it cannot but give to another; and so what the Church of England is entitled to here, by her civil establishment, may be as justly claimed by the presbyterian churches in Scotland and those of the United Provinces, and by the Lutherans in Prussia, Sweden, and Denmark; and if so, they must be supposed to want no essentials to the constitution of a true church of Christ. It will be as great a sin and schism, then, for any, even of the Church of England itself, to divide from their communion in those states, as it is for the dissenters to separate from the national church here. And this seems to place the nature and guilt of schism in nothing so much, as in the departing from any church established by the law of the land. And therefore our author says; 'The Church of England ' would not approve of a schism that should be set up in any other church, though it were for the introducing of those ways of worship ' which they have prescribed.' But we see how true this is, by their building churches, and sending their ministers abroad; and from my lord Clarendon's and Dr. Morley's<sup>u</sup> refusing to communicate

<sup>t</sup> Part ii. p. 394. [667.]

<sup>u</sup> [Dr. Morley was bishop of Winchester, in the reign of king Charles the Second. It will appear from his statement, that he did not decline to join the French congregation at Charenton, (where the celebrated M. Claude was their chief minister,) because they were *protestants*, as Mr. Gale seems to insinuate; but because they were *presbyterians*, and that for weighty reasons; which I here give in his own words, from page viii. of the preface to his 'Several Treatises written ' on several Occasions,' 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1683.

' When I was in France, I did at Paris ' assist Dr. Cozins, late bishop of Durham, ' in preaching to the English *protestants* ' there at Sir Richard Brown's house, then

' resident there for our king; but never ' went to the French presbyterian church ' at Charenton, no more than I did afterwards to that of Caen in Normandy, ' whilst I was there.

' For which being asked the reason, of ' the chief pastor of the church, the ' learned M. Bouchart, my answer was, ' that I forbore to come to their church; ' first, because we had, at my lady Ormond's house, there, a congregation of ' our own, wherein we had not only ' *preaching*, as they had, but a *liturgy* or ' solemn form of worshipping God by ' prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, which ' (as I imagined) they had not in their ' churches. Secondly, Because though I ' understood their language when I read

with the French protestants, under Monsieur Claude ; and my lord Scudamore's withdrawing from the church at Charenton. And the Commons, in a very memorable declaration they drew up in the 19th of James I, say, ' That if his majesty cannot by treaty procure the ' peace and safety of his children abroad, and of the true professors ' (in foreign parts) of the same religion professed by the Church of ' England, they would, to their utmost power, with their lives and ' fortunes, assist him so, as that he may be able to do it with his ' sword.'

If there is no other reason why the dissenters should unite with the church, but her being supported by law, for in all other respects they are supposed equal, the crime can be very little, if at all, less in the latter than in the former ; and the schism must be at least almost equally sinful in both, since there is no essential ground, according to the case supposed, on either side, to justify their separation.

<sup>x</sup> ' Various ceremonies, forms, and methods of ordering church-matters', particular collects or prayers, or clauses of prayers,' Mr. Wall thinks should not be esteemed by the dissenters a sufficient cause of separation. But he knows the imposing these things is thought a sufficient reason, and strongly urged as such too ; and though some can venture to go with him thus far, that upon the supposition these things do not evert the foundation, as he somewhere phrases it, nor appear inconsistent with the fundamentals of the Christian church and religion, they are then, indeed, no good reason why any one should renounce the communion of those saints who are pleased with these ceremonies, &c., yet the same persons think it will not therefore follow that they must constantly conform to all those things, being verily persuaded they may have the liberty notwithstanding, commonly to exercise such ceremonies only, as they like better, and think are more for God's honour and the good of their souls. After this manner Mr. Wall in effect allows<sup>z</sup> they might still continue to be the same church ; for as long as they do

' it, yet I did not understand it when I ' heard it spoken, so well as, though the ' matter were never so good, to be at all ' edified by it. And *thirdly*, Because, if ' they did not favour and encourage, yet ' they did not, at least they had not ' hitherto condemned or reprov'd the ' scandalous and rebellious proceedings of ' their presbyterian brethren in *England*, ' against the *king* and against the *church* : ' which until they should do by some ' public act, or manifestation of their

' judgments to the contrary, I could not ' choose but think they approved, or at ' least did not dislike, what our presbyterians in England had done and were still ' doing. And therefore I did forbear, for ' the present, to join in communion with ' them there at Caen, as I had done formerly, for the very same reasons, with ' those at Charenton.]

<sup>x</sup> Part ii. p. 392. [666.]

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 397. [670.]

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p. 396. [669.]

not renounce one another's communion, but communicate together as should seem convenient, they will scarcely be more different than cathedrals, chapels, and parish-churches, whose forms differ very much in several particulars; some choosing the cathedral-worship, and others the parochial, and yet continuing to be the same church.

Whether this would be granted or no, Mr. Wall cannot possibly deny, but that if those ceremonies, &c., are not of so much consequence as to justify a separation, and that therefore the dissenters are to blame in separating on their account; for the same reason, any church, which unnecessarily insists on these things so stiffly, is full as accessory to the separation, and as guilty of it, and perhaps more guilty, than the dissenters themselves<sup>a</sup>.

For though she may think the ceremonies decent and useful, &c., yet being of an indifferent nature at best, they may either be used or laid aside, as shall be found most convenient; and there is no more necessity from the things themselves, for the use than the disuse of them: wherefore rigidly to resolve to introduce them into the church, or maintain them there, is unnecessarily giving occasion to others not so well satisfied, to disown those things, and the church which imposes them.

And thus the common pretence of their usefulness ceases; and instead of it, they become prejudicial, by creating divisions, which alters the case quite, and renders them not merely indifferent, but unlawful; for though they are indifferent in themselves, I hope our author will not imagine it is an indifferent matter whether they prove an occasion of rending the body of Christ, nor question its being far better, and, to be plain, their indispensable duty too, rather to alter and wholly give up what themselves account so indifferent, than by retaining them, to endanger and break the unity

<sup>a</sup> 'This, with all its consequences, though they bear so hard on such churches, is fully allowed at several turns by the warmest of our adversaries, who really ruin their own cause, and give up all the dissenters ask: thus one of them particularly, who is usually very angry, says, 'We may partake of other men's sins, by 'giving offence or scandalous example.' As men are members of society, they stand responsible not only for the positive legality of the actions, as considered in themselves, and their own natures, solely with respect to the subject-matter of them; but also for their relative consequences, as they may affect the consciences of others, to which we are bound by the laws of charity to give no violation, disturbance, or occasion of transgressing;

and in all our deportment, to consult not only its lawfulness, but its decency and expediency, with regard to our brethren, against whom we may sin, (as St. Paul says, in the admirable state of this case, 1 Cor. viii. 10.) and wound their weak consciences, and sin against Christ. Thus the abuse even of an innocent liberty cannot be justified by a good intention; and we are liable to answer for the fall of those to whom we become a *stumbling-block and a rock of offence*.' Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon at the Assizes held at Derby, Aug. 15, 1709. page 12.

'In giving offence by our actions, we use our liberty for a cloak of maliciousness; and make what would be otherwise innocent, culpable.' Ibid. p. 14.



of the church, which they find is impossible to be preserved while they are retained.

It is strange men can exclaim so bitterly against schism, (and God knows the sin is black enough,) and at the same time know in their consciences they prefer their humours and opinions about external indifferent matters, before the important concern of the peace and edification of the church.

There are several public defences made, by which all men may see how far they can justify themselves, who disown the Church of England, even upon these trifling accounts, as they are thought; and on what grounds they think it cannot be their duty to yield to the national church in her imposing things which are really indifferent: but whether they are able to make a rational defence of themselves or no; nay, let us suppose that some cannot, and yet are resolved to continue their separation; if such unreasonable mistaken men, or what you will please to call them, are found among us, this will not lessen the church's guilt, in so tenaciously continuing to throw the needless occasions in their way. Besides, it is to be believed, all the churches, and the greatest part, if not every private man of the dissenters, are satisfied in their hearts, that the things they dissent for, are not so indifferent as it is said, nor can be received without corrupting the purity of the Christian religion.

This considerably enhances their fault, who in matters they confess to be indifferent, through no necessity, but from the motions of an arbitrary temper only, will bear so hard upon the consciences of such as cannot have the same opinion, and drive them to the desperate dilemma of conforming against their consciences, or breaking the unity of the church. A more Christian and becoming disposition in the governing party might have removed the whole difficulty, without any inconvenience at all, by kindly not insisting on those things which some of their weaker brethren could not digest, and which they themselves likewise are under no manner of necessity to adhere to.

Every society has power, under the supreme authority, to frame by-laws for itself, to which all its members are bound, and may be obliged to submit. So the whole church, undoubtedly, and every particular part of it, may rightfully claim a power, as far as Christ the supreme Head permits, to make such orders and constitutions as they shall judge proper for governing their several bodies. And this is all that, with any face of reason, can be demanded. But this will be of little or no service in excusing the church, or condemning the dissenters, if we consider that this power is not unlimited: but

as the laws of any corporation are null, when repugnant to the general institutions of the nation ; so all prescriptions in the church are of no force, and unlawful, when contrary to any which Jesus Christ, our great Legislator, has ordained ; or when she exceeds the lawful bounds of her power. And therefore, even those who can allow the church is possessed of a legislative power in matters purely indifferent, and are willing to suppose that her members are obliged to comply with her ; infer notwithstanding, that if those things, which are indifferent in themselves, are circumstantiated, as it often happens, so as to destroy any of our Lord's precepts, we are discharged from obedience to our subordinate ecclesiastical governors, and such her decrees are *ipso facto* void.

Nay, they further assert, that though the church might lawfully exercise such power as is pleaded for in matters of liberty, yet as the case stands at present, the dissenters in England, some of them at least, are obliged to separate from the national church, who, as they think, by misusing her power, has rendered the terms of communion unlawful : or if the terms are not so themselves, yet they are apt to suppose she is as much to blame as the dissenters, if by arbitrary impositions she breaks in on fundamental laws, and exceeds her commission ; and by narrowing the gate, prevents many from entering into the church, to her own great injury, whose growth her governors are bound by all lawful means to advance.

Peace and unity are strictly enjoined, and should be the particular care of those whom *the Holy Ghost has made overseers of the flock* ; and yet some men deliberately and with pleasure study inflexibly to maintain and impose those things, which they know by experience confound the unity they preach, and should preserve. It is a chief part of their office, with tenderness, to instruct and relieve the consciences of the people ; but they on the contrary oppress and perplex them, beyond what they are able to bear. Is this agreeable to charity, thus deliberately to constrain us to what they count a sin, and against which themselves pronounce damnation ? ‘ Divisions, schisms, separations, and whatsoever breaks the unity of the church,’ are placed, they say<sup>b</sup>, by St. Paul, in the ‘ roll or catalogue ’ he gives of the sins which are certainly damning ; *which they that practise shall not inherit the kingdom of God,* Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. And notwithstanding this, they are so far from helping us to avoid the danger, that they wilfully lay the unnecessary stumblingblocks before us, which they are assured will and do make us fall, in direct

<sup>b</sup> Part ii. p. 383. [658.]

opposition to the apostle's counsel and pattern<sup>c</sup>, who says, *But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.*

How vastly different from this tender regard and consideration of the infirmities of others, and of how different an original, is the inflexible temper of some nowadays, who rather than part with any thing they have once received, will endanger the salvation of those who cannot subscribe to it, even though it should prove the eternal ruin of thousands *for whom Christ died!*

I have said more on this occasion than at first I intended; but Mr. Wall had suppressed so many particulars, in his treating this head, that it was needful to supply them: for they are material, and give the case of our separation quite another aspect. I might here make several deductions from the observations I have made, and apply them to the condition of the church in England; but I waive it, and only desire you to compare what I have writ with the last chapter in Mr. Wall.

After he has declared the mischief and sin of divisions, &c., he addresses himself to the antipædobaptists: and since I am obliged to follow him, let us briefly consider the point, sir, between the Church of England and them. And first, I must desire you always to remember, Mr. Wall argues on the supposition that we are right, and the other side in the error; and undertakes to shew, we have notwithstanding no sufficient ground to separate: an attempt which appears too extravagant for any but a very partial man to engage in. Would you have thought it possible, sir, without this instance, that a person of sense and reading should assert, it is unlawful to separate from a church, which so freely presumes to innovate in the positive institutions of our Saviour, and impose her own alterations instead of them? And that you may see this is really the case, and judge better how Mr. Wall has acquitted himself in his undertaking, I will present you with our notion of the point.

When our Lord sent out his disciples to preach, and instituted the holy ordinance of baptism, he commanded, that all persons should be first taught to believe in him, and then be admitted into his church and covenant, by being dipped into the water, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* None therefore can be true members of the Christian church the apostles were then sent forth to gather, unless they are accordingly first

taught, and afterwards regularly received, according to our Lord's direction, by dipping them into the water, and pronouncing that sacred form of words he prescribed.

Now our author supposes us in the right in all this; and yet says it is not sufficient to justify our separation. The stress of what he urges lies in this position, that the difference is not about fundamentals; if it were, he acknowledges we ought to separate; but the age or time of receiving baptism cannot be such. But whatever it may be in his opinion, it is a fundamental with us in the constitution of a church: and if he can think the true subject, and the just manner of administering this ordinance, are not of its essence, but wholly indifferent, and what there is no need to be curious in; I assure you we are of another mind, and have more reverence for our Lord's institutions, than to esteem the due performance of them so light a thing. It is of important consequence, we think, to retain his methods punctually, and not deviate in the least particular: for 'it is highly suitable to the nature of things, to believe,' as my lord bishop of Sarum judiciously observes<sup>d</sup>, 'That our Saviour, who has instituted the sacrament, has also either instituted the form of it, or given us such hints as to lead us very near it.' And therefore, if it were not in reality a fundamental, yet while we believe it is, it has the influence of one upon our consciences, and we have the same reason to separate.

If the church has a greater latitude, I appeal to you, sir, which is most expedient and just; that she should close the rupture, by yielding to the tenderness of our consciences, and give up what she esteems so very indifferent; or that we, who are not so at liberty, should act against our consciences, and comply with her?

But I will endeavour to prove, sir, that what we divide for is a fundamental; and, without the help of a supposition, that the established church is possibly in the error. To cut this short (for I would fain have done with this subject) I will not give the reasons our author uses here a particular examination; they are sufficiently answered by the foregoing distinction, between fundamentals of religion, and fundamentals in the constitution of a true Christian church. All he attempts to prove is, that it is not a fundamental article of faith, without which none can be saved; which is nothing to the purpose: for, as I shewed above, there are other causes which not only justify, but also necessitate a separation from a church. Besides, he can never evince this negative from his own principles. He owns baptism itself is a fundamental; and would be understood,

<sup>d</sup> Exposition of the Articles, p. 265. [on the twenty-fifth Article.]



certainly, to mean true Christian baptism, and not every invention of heretics in ancient or modern times: he must comprehend, then, all that is essential to true baptism, or else it will be imperfect; and if these supposed circumstances should be found to be of its essence, it will follow from himself, that these things are fundamentals, as being essential to what is allowed to be so.

Baptism, I grant, is of great necessity; and though I dare fix no limits to the infinite goodness and mercy of God, which I am confident he will give mighty proofs of, in great instances of kindness towards all sincere, though mistaken men; however the gospel-rule is, according to the doctrine of the apostle, *to repent, and be baptized, for the remission of sins*. We should be very cautious therefore of making any change in these things, lest we deprive ourselves, through our presumption, of that title to pardon, without which there is no salvation. But Mr. Wall confesses this; and, I think, it is as clear, that nothing can be Christian baptism which varies from Christ's institution. That only is baptism which he appointed, and therefore that which differs from what he appointed differs from baptism; and to bring in alterations is to change the thing, and make it not the same, but another. This is self-evident, and beyond a question.

The only pretence, I think, that can be devised, is, that our Lord's institution is not so strictly punctilious, and confined in the particular circumstances of it. But Mr. Wall can have no benefit from this evasion; because, as I said before, he supposes our opinion, in this case, is the true, and all he says is to proceed on this supposition. But as baptism is an ordinance of Christ, it must of necessity be celebrated exactly as he appointed: and since to the very being of baptism a subject to whom it must be administered is necessary, and a mode of administering, without which it would be only a notion in the brain: these things, therefore, are as necessary as baptism itself. And hence it follows that the true subjects, which are professed *believers* only, and the true mode, which is only *dipping* into the water, are necessary to true baptism; and consequently a difference in these points is a difference in fundamentals, and so by Mr. Wall's concession a just cause of separation.

It is superfluous, I think, to spend more time to shew these things are as proper fundamentals as baptism itself, and essential to it, without which it is impossible it should be baptism, and wherein its very nature consists. I will go on, therefore, to manifest how just and unavoidable our separation is.

I do not know what Mr. Wall's notion of a church may be; but

if he takes it from the Thirty-Nine Articles he subscribed to at his ordination, it will be plain; for the nineteenth Article says, ‘The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which——the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.’ Now if baptism cannot be duly performed according to Christ’s ordinance, (as we believe, and Mr. Wall supposes it true,) but by dipping believers into the water on the profession of their faith; then that church, which administers it otherwise, cannot be such a church of Christ as the Article speaks of: and if so, it is hard to imagine why it should be unlawful to decline her communion: for her baptism being wrong becomes no baptism; and perhaps some may carry this so far as to question whether such a congregation is a visible church. For if, as I will prove hereafter, her baptism is not true, that is, if she have no baptism, (for Tertulian’s maxim will hold good, ‘They who are not duly baptized are certainly not baptized at all,’) though we do not assert so much, yet to some it will, it may be, seem a little probable, that she may perhaps have no bishops, presbyters, &c., no lawful ordinations; and (if this should be allowed) neither of the sacraments can be duly administered. And then from these suppositions, and by the authority of the Article cited, the clergy of the Church of England in general teach us to infer, that such a congregation can be no more than a pretended church, and that we ought to separate from such an one.

And if, as both sides agree, baptism is a necessary initiation into the Christian church; and if none are baptized but believers dipped into the water, (which you remember, sir, Mr. Wall supposes;) then nothing can be more evident, than that such as are not so baptized are not rightly initiated, and have no title therefore to church-membership, but should be disclaimed.

Before I leave this head I beg leave to observe, how unhandsomely Mr. Wall acts, in supposing us right in our opinion, and yet pronouncing our separation unlawful; and telling us, we ought to unite with persons we are persuaded are not baptized. Would he follow such advice himself, and admit any into the church, if he believed they were without what he esteems baptism? It must be an absurd thing, upon Mr. Wall’s own principle, to receive persons to the holy eucharist before they have given themselves to Christ, and, according to his appointment, washed away their sins. This he will

<sup>e</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 15. page 230. Baptismum, cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent.

think would be to abuse the sacred ordinance, and therefore the Church of England refuses to admit any to the communion, unless they are first not only baptized, but also confirmed; as is resolved at the end of the Order of Confirmation<sup>f</sup>.

I know Mr. Wall would say, he acknowledges baptism itself is a fundamental article, and therefore it has been inserted into some ancient creeds: but modes and circumstances are not so material, and for that reason should not be made a pretext for divisions. I have sufficiently answered this above; but I add, Mr. Wall cannot imagine 'baptism in general,' (which in truth I do not know what to make of, nor how it can be administered, for to baptize with 'baptism in general,' looks like a contradiction,) Mr. Wall, I say, cannot imagine, that baptism in general, without any regard to some conditions and circumstances, is any baptism at all. Nor can I believe, when he makes baptism necessary, he would be understood to mean, that some kind of baptism or other is necessary; but that all modes, circumstances, and the like, are wholly indifferent, and at the discretion of every person or church either: for then the impious customs of the ancient heretics would be as authentic as the sacred form our Lord commanded his disciples. But it has been universally allowed in the church from the beginning, and our author seems to insist on it too, that if the person baptized has an erroneous and not a true faith, according to the Scriptures, concerning GOD the FATHER, and JESUS CHRIST, and the HOLY GHOST; and if the baptism is not administered in that only regular form of words which the institutor prescribed, in the name of the Holy and ever-blessed TRINITY, that baptism is *ipso facto* null and vacated: nay, St. Cyprian, and the council Mr. Wall is so fond of at another time, make even the orthodoxy of the administrator necessary. From hence it appears, that he must be understood to mean true baptism is necessary; which is what we say, and is therefore a sufficient cause of our separation; which thus, you see, our author himself unwarily justifies.

Since he owns Christ's prescribing the words of the institution is the only sufficient authority to fix the form, I cannot but think we should strictly follow the same words of the institution, as the only rule we can be directed by in all things else relating to this ordinance: and then all other parts of baptism, especially the true subject and mode of administration, are as necessary as the true form of words; and if only that form is true which is there

<sup>f</sup> [Mr. Gale ought to have represented the rubric fairly and fully, by adding its latter clause, 'or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.']

prescribed, then those only are the lawful subjects, and that the right mode which is there likewise specified; and these are therefore of the foundation, as well as the form of words, and without either of these the baptism is invalid.

In short, we refuse to communicate with the Church of England, for the same reason that she refuses to communicate with persons she cannot esteem baptized; and therefore it must look very strange now, that any of her members should press us to act contrary to her rules and determinations, and join with such as we conclude are without baptism: and we should still be guilty of a worse prevarication, if they prevailed on us to grant theirs to be a sufficient baptism, and at the same time keep our present opinion of our own. This would be acknowledging two baptisms, against the express declaration of the apostle, whose judgment we more willingly depend on, that there is only *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*. And if CHRIST, as we are well assured, (and our author, you are to remember, supposes,) commanded only to baptize such as actually believed in him, according to the preaching of the disciples, then the baptism so given is alone the true one baptism, which is certainly necessary; and we are obliged and warranted by Divine authority to own that and no other.

This is what I judged needful to say, in order to justify our separation, and demonstrate how very frivolous Mr. Wall's reasoning about it is. But after he has laboured to prove our separation schismatical and sinful, (as if he believed the business was effectually done,) he is pleased to propose the terms of an union; which are in sum, that the Church of England shall kindly condescend to remain in all particulars just as she is, and the antipædobaptists shall humbly submit themselves and their consciences to the power and persecutions of the angry party in the church: or if they retain their opinions concerning baptism, they shall be indulged in that, provided they will be careful to keep them to themselves.

How impartial and feasible a proposal is here! Could he, think you, forbear smiling at it himself, or in earnest expect it should be embraced? He confesses the church may present antipædobaptists, and has done it, while they were reputed her members, and were consequently in her power: and I can tell him, however he may smooth over the matter, they have taken the warning, and will not put it to the venture again; and they think themselves highly obliged to the government for the protection it gives them. They will never be persuaded, on our author's terms especially, to rely



on the favour of the ecclesiastics, and strip themselves of the inviolable security of that toleration our most gracious and pious Queen has so often and so solemnly declared 'she will maintain.'

Though it should be granted the Church of England, like all other societies, has power over her own body; yet she has certainly none over those who withdraw from her communion. It was a home reflection therefore on the wisdom and authority of the Queen and parliament, for our author to insinuate, that the 'Act of toleration<sup>b</sup> cannot tie up the church's hands from any proceedings 'against dissenters;' who besides, by being out of her body, are merely, on that account, out of her power. It is notorious that this does tie up the hands of the angry party; and we are so extremely sensible of her Majesty's goodness in taking this method, that we beg her Majesty graciously to give us leave still to rely solely on herself and parliament, under God, for security; for all other we disown. As for 'the general forbearance which is now used<sup>i</sup>;' there are some who practise it only out of necessity, and because they cannot help it. But should the Toleration be once repealed, I fear this good temper would vanish like a vapour. For Mr. Wall cannot but remember the prosecution and excommunication he pronounced against Mrs. Hall of his parish.

And doubtless he has not wholly forgot that he presented Mr. Joseph Brown his neighbour, for not bringing his children to be christened. I confess, he sometime afterwards asked that gentleman's pardon for what he had done; who very readily forgave him: and I should, therefore, never have mentioned the thing, but that I have observed Mr. Wall is troubled with moderation and forbearance but very rarely, by sudden fits and starts, which are no sooner over than he finds himself as violent and inveterate as ever: or if he be now indeed changed, (as I should be heartily glad to be assured he is,) he may however very well think there are some of that same disposition still, who would never suffer us to be quiet.

But had Mr. Wall been serious, he should have made a proposal more fair and equal on both sides, and proper to establish unity and concord on the principles of the first churches of Christians. In order to this, it would be requisite, and I think none can except against it, that some fit persons were chosen on both sides, to examine the Scriptures impartially, and the Fathers of the first three centuries, who followed their great Master through sufferings, and whose writings are undoubtedly by far the best commentary on the sacred books; and with these helps to collect from the word of God

<sup>b</sup> Part ii. p. 410, 411. [682.]

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. p. 411. [683.]

the true doctrine and discipline of the primitive catholic church : and to what should be thus sincerely deduced, every one should resolve to conform, without reserve. And I doubt not, if an union were endeavoured on this expedient, it would be accomplished much more easily than is imagined.

I just hint at this, to shew Mr. Wall might have chosen a more reasonable method than he did. But it is not likely he should come into it, because he seems of an imperious temper, and positive in his opinions, which he would force upon others and not bend himself. And for this I appeal, among other things, to the several places where he complains of the mischiefs of the magistrates granting tolerations. Why did not he embellish his paragraphs with the famous examples of Judas, and Pilate, and the high priest, who as wisely cut off the ringleader of that sect which endeavoured to abolish *the traditions of the elders*? For these things will be found to be of just the same kind, if the words of the king in the parable be true, Matt. xxv. 40, that what is done to his *brethren* he accounts as done to himself. But had not our author forgot that it is as indecent as it is unjust to talk thus? For this is to reflect on the wisdom and lenity of the British government, and in effect to magnify the French fashion of dragooning people, only for endeavouring to preserve a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. But sure our poor protestant brethren in France deserve rather to be pitied and relieved, than thus silyly insulted and condemned : and God be thanked, they are, and will be kindly entertained with us, to the immortal honour of our gracious Queen, by whose pious liberality so many afflicted families are comfortably subsisted. And she has most kindly endeavoured to have the like toleration settled by other princes, her allies, abroad, which she has confirmed at home. So extensive is her goodness ! But it touches me very close, to see a man, whose function is to serve at the altar, and minister in the holy things of the gospel, of a complexion so repugnant to the meekness, love, and charitable forbearance which Christ so often, so strictly enjoined ; and I am concerned that some of the leaders of the church do not know *what manner of spirit they are of*.

Now, to conclude ; I hope I have made out, sir, what I took upon me to prove ; which was, that Mr. Wall is not a writer to repose a full confidence in : but has committed several mistakes, and must be read warily, and with suspicion.

I am, &c.

## LETTER III.

ANOTHER instance of Mr. Wall's unfairness—The dispute between the English pædobaptists and us cast under two heads—It is strange, things so clear should be capable of so much dispute—So far as the Scriptures are clear, our practice is allowed to be exactly agreeable therewith—Therefore if we err, we are, however, on the safer side—GOD has revealed his will with sufficient clearness, in all material points—And he has not left it doubtful in what manner, or to what subjects, baptism should be administered—A trifling remark of Mr. Wall's noted—It is better not to pretend to baptize persons, than not to do it as CHRIST requires it should be done—The Greek word for *baptize* always signifies to *dip* only in any manner of thing—So Lycophron—And Sophocles—But more commonly it is used for dipping into liquids—So Homer—Metaphors include and borrow their beauties from the thing from whence they are taken—Pindar and his scholiast—Euripides and his scholiasts—Aristophanes in many places—The words in dispute frequently applied to the dyer's art: and they colour things by dipping them—Several passages wherein the word alludes to the art of dying, considered—The improper use of words in metaphorical passages cannot be supposed to alter their signification—Figurative forms of speech are only abbreviated similes—It is no objection to say, if words are always literally understood, authors will be made to speak nonsense—Figurative sentences not literally true, as they stand; but being defective, the sense must be supplied—We should distinguish between the sense of a phrase, as it includes some words not expressed; and the sense of the particular words singly considered, just as they stand—Words have no more than one signification—Words are always to be taken in their literal sense—The use of these observations in the present dispute—More instances from Aristophanes—Πλύνω is to *wash by dipping*—More instances from Aristotle—from Heraclides Ponticus—from Herodotus Halicarnassæus—from Theocritus—from Moschus—from Aratus—from Callimachus—from Dionysius Halicarnassæus—from Strabo—from Plutarch—from Lucian—from the emperor Marcus Antoninus—The metaphorical use of the word in dispute, when applied to the mind, considered and explained—Other instances from Pollux—From Themistius—That lexicographers and critics render the word by *lavo* is no argument they ever understood it to mean less than to *dip*.

---

SIR,

By Mr. Wall's character, which I have given you at large in my former, you may judge of his temper and design: but there is one remarkable instance of his disingenuity not yet taken notice of, which must by no means be omitted: I mean his unfair pretences, and false assertions, concerning the word βαπτίζω. I designed to have mentioned this before, but considering it is a branch of our main dispute, and requires a particular examination, I deferred it, and will enter on it now.

As the controversy stands between us and the English pædobaptists, it may be cast under two heads : one relating to the mode of baptism, whether it is to be administered only by dipping ; and the other, (which must be handled more fully,) is, who are the true subjects of it, whether adult persons alone, or infants also.

One would wonder a thing of this nature should be capable of so much dispute : for if it is not instituted, it ought not to be practised ; and if it be instituted, it should seem impossible for any not to see it. But if there is indeed reasonable ground for these doubts, and a matter of such importance is involved in such inextricable difficulties, as some pretend ; I think it reflects highly on the legislator's conduct, who has ordained laws, on the performance of which our eternal salvation depends, and yet left the sense and construction of them so perplexed and hard to be known. But we are well assured it is not so ; and are more concerned for the honour and goodness of God, than to imagine, with our author and his party, that our blessed SAVIOUR has not plainly enough told us what he expects from us : no, we are confident he has declared his will to us, in this and all other articles of like consequence, with all necessary evidence ; and what he has not taught us with a sufficient clearness, he never designed for the object of obedience.

Our enemies allow, that as far as the Scriptures are clear in the present case, our practice exactly agrees with them ; and they must confess too their own is very different from what the text declares to have been done in the ancient times. Thus they allow, nothing is more clearly set down in Holy Writ, than that those who believed were to be, and actually were baptized, by being immersed or dipped into the water on the profession of their faith : and that our practice thus far punctually answers, is beyond contradiction : whence it follows, that the practice of the pædobaptists, where it differs from ours, is not conformable to something delivered in Scripture : and therefore on the whole, we do what the Scriptures expressly teach ; while they, at best, do but what is very obscurely, and perhaps not at all taught in them. That the apostles and the primitive church did dip when they baptized, is plain ; but that they used sprinkling or affusion likewise, is not : and that they baptized adult persons who declared their faith in our REDEEMER, is clear ; but that ever any infant was baptized by them, is again confessed on all hands not to be so evident.

As far as we go, then, we have the Scriptures undoubtedly justifying us ; but where they leave us, we stop, not daring to venture beyond their direction, as thinking it safer to walk by their light,



than to wander in unknown paths. If this be a fault, (as I cannot tell how to think it one,) it is a fault however on the safer hand: for what can poor fallible mankind do better, than where two things seem to clash, to follow that which is clear, rather than uncertain conjectures, or even the fairest probabilities? which (to suppose more than is true) is the most that can be urged for our adversaries.

These considerations alone, if nothing else could be added, would render our case secure, and far the more eligible. But we have infinitely more to say in our behalf: for God has truly revealed his will with clearness, and not couched it in ambiguous terms and mysterious forms of speech, like the oracles of the heathens; he designed to be obeyed, and has spoke so as to be understood: and we cannot but think, to deduce a sense from the words which was not intended, is very difficult, and requires artifice and violence; whereas the genuine meaning wants no such labour, but is natural and easy: and whatever sense, therefore, appears constrained, ought at least to be suspected as foreign from the true.

For these as well as other reasons, sir, which I shall lay before you in the prosecution of this discourse, we cannot believe it is so doubtful in Scripture as many pretend, whether dipping only be baptism, and whether believers alone may lawfully be baptized. These are the chief questions in debate between the paedobaptists and us; which, if they can be amicably determined, will go far towards putting an end to the separation. But Mr. Wall's management is not likely to have so good success; the point must be treated with more temper and modesty, as well as stronger argument, if it be really intended to gain us; but neither his arguments, nor any other which yet have been produced, will prove what they are brought for, as I will now endeavour to shew: and I will begin with the words βαπτίζω and βάπτω, for they are synonymous, as Mr. Wall himself likewise seems to allow; and therefore I shall promiscuously cite the instances wherein one or the other word occurs.

Our author, to make us look very inflexible and cruel, begins what he says upon this head with this frightful remark, 'That we are possessed with an opinion of the absolute necessity of dipping the baptized person over head and ears into the water, so far, as to let any man, though ever so sick, die unbaptized, rather than baptize him by affusion,' &c. Which you are to imagine is a great piece of barbarity, because in so doing it is supposed we choose to expose a person to the hazard of being damned, rather than

recede from our fixed method. But Mr. Wall might have spared the reflection, since himself allows the desire of baptism is sufficient where baptism itself cannot be had; so that the consequence of our refusing to administer that ordinance in such a manner is not so terrible as he insinuates.

Besides, we think it better to do thus, than to delude dying men with false performances, and let them go out of the world, as paedobaptists do, without real baptism, or even a desire of it, which doubtless is much worse than what we are charged with. But to make a show of tenderness and compassion, such generous men as our author and his party have found out an expedient, rather than suffer persons to go into eternity, without being first baptized for the remission of their sins;—to baptize, i. e. dip them by affusion or sprinkling.

But notwithstanding the inventions which ingenious men may be fond of, I am honestly for sitting down with the simplicity of the first Christians, and keeping to the good old way: the fine improvements introduced since are too curious and subtle for me to comprehend them; and I cannot see but ‘the word *baptize* necessarily includes dipping in its signification, and that Christ by commanding to baptize, has commanded to dip only<sup>a</sup>.’ Mr. Wall indeed tells me this ‘is plainly a mistake;’ but I have no great opinion of his judgment, and would not take his word; on the contrary, I hope to make it appear plainly to be an unavoidable truth, and no mistake. In order to this, I must desire you, sir, to consider how the word is used among the Greeks, by the particulars which follow:

I have carefully observed it a considerable time, as it occurred in reading; and assure you I never found it once used to signify ‘to pour or sprinkle,’ or any thing less than dipping; and I may challenge any man to shew a single instance of it, except in some ecclesiastical writers of the latter corrupt times; who retaining the words of the institution, and altering the thing, do, in this case indeed, but no other, extend the word into a wider sense; but profane authors, who lay under no such bias, have made no such alteration. It is evident from them, the primary meaning is simply ‘to dip,’ not only into water, but any matter.

Thus Lycophron, representing Cassandra prophesying how Orestes should punish Clytemnestra for her parricide, says, ‘The child, discovering his father’s murder, shall, with his own hand (βαπτει)

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. p. 219. [536.]

‘ thrust his sword into the viper’s body<sup>b</sup>;’ or, as the great Scaliger has more literally translated it, ‘ *merget*, shall plunge his sword into ‘ the viper’s bowels,’ that is, run her through. It cannot be pretended that this is a figurative expression, for the sense of the word plainly appears to be natural and direct, and to contain no metaphor in it.

Exactly the same phrase is that of Sophocles, (ἐβαψας,) ‘ Thou ‘ hast dipped, or thrust thy sword into the Grecian army<sup>c</sup>;’ and *plonger l’armée*, in this very sense, is common enough in the French tongue. Mr. Dryden likewise expresses the poet’s sense thus, in the 7th Æneid, v. 638 :

‘ Thus having said, her smould’ring torch, impress’d  
‘ With her full force, she plung’d into his breast.’

I might multiply examples to this purpose; but βαπτίζω is more commonly used to signify ‘ to dip’ into liquids; not from any necessity in the word, but because liquids are most proper for this action, which also is mostly performed in them. It would be endless to collect all the instances of this kind in authors, who frequently use the word in this sense, but never once to signify ‘ washing’ in general, or ‘ sprinkling.’ Nay, I do not remember one passage, where all other senses are not necessarily excluded besides ‘ dipping;’ as may be seen from these quotations.

Homer, (for we will begin with him as the most ancient, and trace it down to the latter period of the Grecian empire,) describing Ulysses with his companions putting out Polyphemus’ eye with a burning brand, and what abundance of blood issued out and quenched the brand with a loud hissing, illustrates it with this simile, ‘ As when a smith to harden a hatchet or massy poleaxe ‘ (βάπτει) dips them in cold water<sup>d</sup>.’ If any one can doubt what the word imports here, any blacksmith’s boy will set him right by an ocular demonstration. And in his Batrachomyomachia, (if he be the author of that excellent ludicrous poem, and not Pigres, brother to Artemisia, as Plutarch is inclined to believe,) when one of the champions is slain on the bank of a lake, he says, ‘ He breathless ‘ fell, and the lake was ting’d (ἐβάπτετο) with blood<sup>e</sup>.’

I the rather mention this, because if any place is brought to prove βάπτω and βαπτίζω do not always signify ‘ to dip,’ I fancy

<sup>b</sup> Cassandr. v. 1121. Εἰς σπλάγχχν’ ἐχίδνης αὐτόχειρ βάψει ξίφος.

<sup>c</sup> Ajace, v. 95. Ἐβαψας ἔγχος εὖ πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατῷ.

<sup>d</sup> Ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς πέλεκυν μέγαν, ἥε σκέπαρνον,  
Εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτει, &c. Odys. I. 392.

<sup>e</sup> V. 218. Κάδδ’ ἔπεσ’ οὐδ’ ἀνένευσεν, ἐβάπτετο δ’ αἵματι λίμνη.

this will be one. But, whatever some may do, you understand the nature of languages too well, sir, to make it an exception ; and all who have made any observations of the use of words in their mother-tongue, must be sensible it is not against what I assert, but for it. The phrase, we must consider, is borrowed from the dyers, who colour things by dipping them in their dye ; and to this the poet plainly alludes : not that the lake was actually dipped in blood ; but so speedily stained, that to heighten our idea, he expresses it, with the usual liberty of poets, by a word which signifies more than what is strictly true, which is the nature of all hyperboles. Thus the literal sense is, ‘The lake was dipped in blood ;’ but the figure only means, it was coloured as highly as any thing that is dipped in blood.

I am apt to think *ῥοπερ*, *ῥοσανεῖ*, &c., are to be understood here to qualify the seeming extravagance of the expression ; as also in all hyperboles, which I take to be so many elliptical phrases in which a word is wanting : now if we suppose the poet, as it is natural enough, suppresses some particle, and we supply it by inserting *ῥοπερ*, the sense will run very clear thus ; ‘The lake was as if it had ‘been dipped in blood.’ Whether you will allow this criticism or not, you cannot but say, nothing could render the passage more expressive, or the sense more natural and easy.

Every metaphor, you will remember, sir, includes the thing from whence it is borrowed, receives its whole force from it, and must have its sense determined by it. To give an instance from the fine language of Thucydides : Pericles, in an oration there, reminds the murmuring Athenians, that they ought to labour to support the dignity of the commonwealth, by maintaining the independent power and command they were all so proud off, ‘and either not fly ‘from dangers, or not pursue after honours.’ In the word *φεύγειν*, *to fly*—and *διώκειν*, *to pursue*—is an allusion to the fortune of a battle, where one side is worsted and flies, and the other pursues them : and thus understood, the words have a mighty emphasis in them ; but otherwise, no meaning at all, but are solecisms both in language and sense too.

To speak but of one : *διώκειν* signifies only to pursue, as a conqueror does a flying enemy : and when transferred to another case, it continues to signify the same thing, in some respect or other : sit is a shorter kind of simile, where several things are implied which

<sup>f</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 63. Τῆς τε πόλεως ὑμῶς εἰκὸς τῷ τιμωμένῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔρχειν (ῥοπερ ἅπαντες ἀγάλλεσθε) βοηθεῖν, καὶ μὴ φεύ-

γειν τοὺς πόνους, ἢ μηδὲ τὰς τιμὰς διώκειν.  
 & Aristot. Poetic. cap. 22. Τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν, τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστὶ.



are not expressed; at least the beauty of it lies in comparing the proper import of the word with what it is used to signify by the figure. Thus the eagerness and vigour with which a victorious pursues a routed army, is applied to that passion for glory which was so conspicuous in the Athenians. And to bring it closer to our purpose: the effect being as it were the same, Homer, by putting the cause for the effect, describes the lake's being thoroughly stained, by a word which signifies a dyer's dipping a thing to colour it.

From all this it appears, that the sense of βάπτω, even in this place, is *to dip*, and nothing else. I have insisted the larger on it here, because I do not know whether I shall care to take the same pains with all other metaphorical passages. If you find any which seem material, and I should let them go unobserved, examine them by what is here advanced, and I am persuaded the difficulties will presently vanish: if they do not, pray acquaint me with them, and I will consider them with all impartiality and attention. But to proceed.

The next author I shall mention is Pindar; who upon his enemies' basely aspersing him, describes his contempt of their impotent malice by this simile, which, as literally as I can render it in English, is thus<sup>b</sup>: 'As when a net is cast into the sea, the cork swims above; so (ἀβάπτιστος) am not I sunk,' viz. in their reproaches. And by the way, this place confirms what I a little before advanced, that figures are but a short imperfect simile; for ἀβάπτιστος here is full as metaphorical as that which I cited from Homer: (and Horace seems to imitate this of Pindar, lib. i. Epist. 2.

———Aspera multa

Pertulit, adversis rerum immersabilis undis.)

Τὸ φελλὸς, the thing whence the simile is taken, being added, the sense is very clear; and the word, it is evident, intends that the cork, while the net sinks down into the sea, cannot itself be forced down, but will float above. This is so plain, that I think it neither wants nor can have an explanation: but the words of the ancient Greek scholiast on the place, tending so much to confirm my assertion, I will transcribe them: 'For like the cork of a net in the sea, I swim, and (οὐ βαπτίζομαι) am not sunk. 'As the cork, though loaded with the tackle, does not sink, οὐ δύνει; so I also

<sup>b</sup> Pyth. II. 139. "Ατε γὰρ εἰνάλιον πόγον ἐ-  
χοίσας βαθὺν σκευῆς ἐτέρας, ἀβά-  
πτιστός εἰμι, φελλὸς ὥς  
ὕπὲρ ἔρκος ἄλμας.

‘am immersible (ἀβάπτιστος) like it, and not to be overwhelmed. ‘They rail at me, indeed,’ says he: ‘but as when the net is cast, and sunk under water, the cork remains (ἀβάπτιστος) immersible, and swims on the surface on the sea, being of a nature which (ἀβάπτιστος) cannot sink; in like manner cannot I (ἀβάπτιστος) sink or be overwhelmed in the calumnies and detractions of others; for I am of another nature, and as the cork is in a fishing-net.’

Thus the scholiast, you see, sir, by his use of the word, leaves not the least room to imagine it ever signifies *to sprinkle* or *pour*, or any thing but to *dip*, or *put under*, or *into*. And it is very remarkable, that he seems to have thought no word more proper than this to express what you see plainly is his sense: but as often as he repeats the same thing, which he does *ad nauseam*, though it had been needful to vary the word, and avoid that unpleasantness of the repetition, he changes it but once, and then he has δύνει instead of it; which you know, sir, signifies *to sink*, though not so emphatically as βαπτίζω: witness Pollux in Onomast.

In the next place, give me leave to cite Euripides. The Grecians had sacrificed Polyxena to the ghost of Achilles; and after the solemnity, they permitted Hecuba to bury her daughter’s body: in order to which, according to the known custom of her country on such occasions, she designs first to wash and purify the corpse: for which purpose she calls out to her servant<sup>i</sup>, ‘Go, take the water-pot, my good old maid, and (βάψας) dip it in the sea, and bring it hither,’ &c., for the sea-waters were thought naturally more cleansing than others, as Didymus<sup>k</sup> and Eustathius<sup>l</sup> tell us.

Βάπτειν ποντίας ἄλος, the phrase the poet puts into Hecuba’s mouth on this occasion, can have no ambiguity in it; and the scholiast renders it exceeding plain by the parallel phrases he mentions: thus τὸ ἔφαγε τοῦ ἄρτου, is *to eat bread*; and τὸ ἔπιε τοῦ οἴνου, *to drink wine*: and so βάπτειν ποντίας ἄλος is, as we commonly say in English, *to dip a pail of water*. But if it will be more satisfaction to you, I will bring the decisive determination of a Grecian critic, whom Arsenius archbishop of Monembasia thought fit to be admitted, among other great ones, into his collection of Scholiasts upon Euripides. One of them says expressly on this place, βάπτειν<sup>m</sup>

<sup>i</sup> Hecub. Act. 3. v. 609. tot. Dram.

Σὺ δ’ αὖ λαβοῦσα τεύχος, ἀρχαία λάτρι,  
βάψας ἔνεγκε δέυρο ποντίας ἄλος.

<sup>k</sup> Didym. ad Iliad. α’. v. 314. Φύσει δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης καθαρτικὸν ἐστιν.

<sup>l</sup> Eustath. ibid. p. 108. Ἡ πάντως διὰ τὸ φύσει ῥυπτικὸν εἶναι τὸ τῆς θαλάσσης ὕδωρ.

<sup>m</sup> Βάπτειν ἐστὶ τὸ χαλᾶν τι εἰς ὕδωρ, ἢ εἰς ἑτερόν τι ὑγρόν.

signifies 'to let down, or put any thing into water or any other 'liquid.' He explains it by the very same word which is used by St. Luke, Acts ix. 25, and in his Gospel, ch. v. 4, 5, to express letting the net down into the sea: and so also by St. Mark, ch. ii. 4. Accordingly, either the same critic therefore, or some other from whom Arsenius takes it, observes a little before, that the 'water was to be drawn out of the inmost parts of the sea<sup>n</sup>;' having an eye, undoubtedly, to the meaning of the word, which must be *to dip*, or the remark is wholly groundless: for in any other sense there can be no occasion, nor indeed any room for it.

Aristophanes uses the word several times: I have marked down fourteen, which I believe are all the places where it occurs; and they none of them in the least favour Mr. Wall's pretences, but, on the contrary, make very strongly for the opinion I advance. The Grecians very frequently apply the word, in all its various forms, to the dyer's art; sometimes perhaps not very properly, but always so as to imply and refer only to its true natural signification, *to dip*.

Thus, 'dress not with costly clothes,' says this poet<sup>o</sup>, 'which (βαπτῶν) are dyed or dipped in the richest colours.' And so again in his comedy, entitled *Peace*<sup>p</sup>; and in his *Lysistrata*<sup>q</sup>. Aristotle likewise uses it so, when he says<sup>r</sup>, 'All these things, by means of 'heat and moisture, enter the pores of such things as are dipped (βαπτομένων) into them, which retain the colour they have taken, 'when the moisture is dried away.' And at the end of the same chapter<sup>s</sup>; 'The colour of things dipped or dyed (βαπτομένων) is 'changed by the foresaid causes.' And Plutarch, speaking of *Lycurgus*' care to secure the commonwealth from all those arts which introduce or encourage luxury; among the rest, says<sup>t</sup>, 'he forbade 'to practise the art of dying, (βαφικὴν,) or dipping into colours, 'because it tended to effeminate the mind, by engaging and flat-  
'tering the senses.'

But there is a great plenty of examples of this kind<sup>u</sup>, which it is needless to mention: and I believe there is no occasion to go about to persuade you, that workmen dye by dipping; and for that reason have appropriated the word to their business. However, lest there

<sup>n</sup> Ὅδωρ δηλονότι, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνδοτάτου μέ-  
ρου τῆς θαλάσσης.

<sup>o</sup> Plut. Act. 2. Scen. 5. Οὐδ' ἱματίων  
βαπτῶν δαπάναις κοσμησάι ποικιλομόρφων.

<sup>p</sup> Page 672, 674.

<sup>q</sup> Page 828.

<sup>r</sup> De Coloribus, cap. 4. Ἀεὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ  
πάντων αὐτῶν, ἅμα τῷ τε ὑγρῷ καὶ τῷ θερ-  
μῷ τῶν χρωμάτων συνεισίνδυνται εἰς τοὺς τῶν

βαπτομένων πόρους, ὅταν ἀποξηρανθῇ, τὰς  
ἀπ' ἐκείνων χροὰς ἀπολαμβάνει.

<sup>s</sup> Τῶν δὲ βαπτομένων τὰ χρώματα, ἀλ-  
λοιοῦνται διὰ τὰς εἰρημένας αἰτίας.

<sup>t</sup> Apophth. Lacon. p. 405. Τὴν δὲ βα-  
φικὴν, ὥς κολακίαν αἰσθήσεως.

<sup>u</sup> Herodot. Polymn. p. 258. Ctes. In-  
diciis passim, &c.

be any suspicion in you that it might perhaps be performed in some other manner, I will only desire you would please to consider dipping is the only probable and convenient way; and in every respect perfectly agreeable to the nature of the thing, as well as to that sense of the word, which is very considerable. We see it is the only way with us; and, which carries the parallel still further between the ancient Greeks and us, as they used βάπτω, we use the word *dip*, both among the workmen in the shop and in ordinary conversation; for what is more common than to talk of having such or such a thing dipped, meaning in the dyer's copper, or in some colours? So Mr. Milton has used it, in his beautiful description of the angel Raphael, *Paradise Lost*, b. v.

—The middle pair, [i. e. of his wings,]  
Girt like a starry zone his waist, and round  
Skirted his loins and thighs with downy gold,  
And colours dipped in heaven.

Besides, it is observable that the Grecians made a difference between dye and other colouring matter: thus Plutarch<sup>x</sup> distinguishes between χρώματα and βάμματα; and Pollux<sup>y</sup> does the same; βάμματα signifying only that sort of colouring into which any thing is dipped, according to the sense of the word, as I see Stephens<sup>z</sup> also has remarked. And there is a passage in Seneca<sup>a</sup> very clear to this purpose: ‘Interest, quam diu macerata sit, crassius medicamentum an aquatius traxerit, sæpius mersa sit et excocta, an semel tineta.’ ‘There is a difference also, how long it lies infused; whether the dye be thick and gross, or waterish and faint; and whether it be dipped very often and boiled thoroughly, or only once tintured.’ And Phavorinus<sup>b</sup> and Pollux<sup>c</sup> use καταβάπτων, which on all hands is allowed most emphatically to signify *dipping, plunging, immersing*, as a synonymous word for βάπτων, and χρωωννδς, in English ‘a dyer.’

This makes it necessary to suppose they dyed by dipping; as well as another word used among them in these cases, viz. ἐψευ *to boil*: ‘They boil it in kettles,’ says Aristotle<sup>d</sup>;—‘and when the flowers are boiled long enough together, at length all becomes of a purple colour.’ And Hesychius and Pollux interpret the same word of dying. Now if they used to boil the things they dyed, undoubtedly

<sup>x</sup> De Discernend. Amic. et Adulat.  
p. 94. med.

<sup>y</sup> Onomast. lib. vii. cap. 23.

<sup>z</sup> Ad voc. χρώμα.

<sup>a</sup> Quæst. Natural. lib. i. cap. 3. p. 484.

<sup>b</sup> Page 358.

<sup>c</sup> Onomastic. lib. vii. cap. 23.

<sup>d</sup> De Coloribus, cap. 5. Ἐψωσιν ἐν ταῖς χύτραις — καὶ τότε τελευταῖον ἅπαντα γίνεταί πορφυροειδῆ τῶν ἀνθέων ἱκανῶς συνεψθέντων.



they first dipped or put them into the liquor. But enough of this.

There are other passages, somewhat akin to these, which seem however to leave a little more room for the objections of our adversaries; where, though indeed the word is used, it appears by other circumstances that the writer could not mean *dip* by it. We may see instances of this in Aristophanes; as where he says, Magnes, an old comic of Athens, used the 'Lydian music, shaved the face, and 'smeared it over (*βαπτόμενος*) with tawny washes<sup>e</sup>. He speaks of the homely entertainments of the ancient theatre, where the actors daubed themselves with lees of wine, and any odd colours, before Æschylus reformed it, and introduced the use of masks and visors. Aristophanes expresses this by *βαπτόμενος βατραχείοις*; not that he supposes they dipped their faces into the colour, but rather smeared the colour on their faces. He has also<sup>f</sup> *βαπτὸς ὄρνις* for a *coloured bird*, not implying it was dyed by art, but only denoting its natural colour by that epithet. In like manner Aristotle says<sup>g</sup>, 'If it is 'pressed, it dyes (*βάπτει*) and colours the hand;' and Plutarch<sup>h</sup>, 'That which is black of itself, is not (*βαπτόν*) dyed or coloured by 'art, but by nature,' &c.

But those persons who would depend upon these passages to prove that *βάπτω* signifies something else besides dipping, must consider, there is a manifest allusion in these and all such to the art of *dying*. And if the word is borrowed from thence, as none can be hardy enough to deny, they must allow it is used there improperly and metaphorically, and that its true primitive meaning only is still referred to, and implied. What I said above upon the second citation from Homer, which is exactly the same phrase with these, may therefore equally serve to explain all such passages: and I desire you would carry it along with you, sir, in reading, to save me the trouble of repeating it.

If in all allusive metaphorical expressions we suppose the sense of words to be altered, there will be the greatest confusion in languages imaginable, and much beyond that of Babel. All words had a determinate signification there, in themselves; and the people were miraculously rendered incapable of understanding one another, not by the various significations of the same word, but, as it is generally believed, by new ones being instantly put into the mouths of those,

<sup>e</sup> Ἰππεῖς, Act. 1. Scen. 3. p. 300. Καὶ λυδίῳ, καὶ ψηνίῳ καὶ βαπτόμενος βατραχείοις.

<sup>f</sup> Ὀρνιθ. p. 526.

<sup>g</sup> Hist. Animal. lib. v. cap. 15. p. 645.

Θλιβόμενος δὲ, βάπτει καὶ ἀνθίζει τὴν χεῖρα.

<sup>h</sup> Quæst. Rom. 26. p. 482, 483. Τὸ δὲ αὐτόχροον μέλαν, οὐχ ὑπὸ τέχνης ἀλλὰ φύσει βαπτόν ἐστι, &c.

who were made at the same time as suddenly to forget the old ones they had been always used to.

We are by no means therefore to imagine words are of so vagrant and uncertain a meaning: the improper use of them does not change their sense; otherwise there could be no improper use, no figures of speech, and no allusions; for the sense, not the letters of a word, is the foundation of the allusion; and if the natural sense is changed, and another substituted, words are used alike properly in all cases, and only for what they literally signify: and so losing in such cases their former signification, all metaphors, allusions, hyperboles, &c., are lost too. But the allusion being so plain in the case before us, I insist upon it, that the word literally signifies only *to dip*, or *put into*, &c., and, as I noted before, *ῥοπερ*, or some such particle, is to be understood, to qualify the seeming extravagance of the expression, which is a sort of abbreviated simile, where a great part is suppressed and concealed; and only so much expressed as will hint the rest to the mind, and give it occasion to supply it. This observation will, without much difficulty, be admitted by all who have any knowledge in, and made any observations about, the nature and use of languages; and I shall elsewhere have occasion to cite some words from Plato, which considerably illustrate, or rather enforce it.

It is very pertinent to this purpose what the scholiast says on a passage of Aristophanes<sup>i</sup>, which is literally thus; ‘Lest I dip you (*βάψω*) into a Sardinian, i. e. a scarlet dye.’ The sense of it, says the scholiast, is, ‘If you do not tell me the truth, I will beat you till I make you all red with blood<sup>k</sup>.’ That is, (to fill up the sense of the poet from his scholiast,) ‘I will beat you till you are besmeared over with blood, and as red as if I had dipped you in scarlet.’ But the poet, to carry off something of the littleness, which in a thought so low and familiar would otherwise too much have shewn itself, uses a more raised and vigorous expression here, instead of this long sentence, which would have been too tedious and flat.

It is no objection to say, that if the word in such places signifies literally nothing but *to dip*, &c., the sense, if it must be supposed there can be any, will be absurd, as well as most grossly false. For indeed what can be more ridiculous, than for a man seriously to talk of dipping a lake or river, &c. in blood? or of a lady’s dipping her face in vermilion, when she adorns it with artificial colour;

<sup>i</sup> Ἀχαρν. Act. 1. Scen. 3. “Ἴνα μή σε βάψω βάμμα σαρδινιακόν.

<sup>k</sup> Βούλεται οὖν δηλοῦν ὅτι εἰ μή εἴποις τᾷληθές, μαστίζων σέ ἐρυθρόν ποιήσω τοῖς αἵμασι.

which, on the contrary, it is known must be more artfully laid on. I readily grant, the words, as they stand in the passages referred to, are not literally true; and if it could be imagined the authors intended they should be literally understood, they would appear very ridiculous, and deserve the utmost contempt: but it is plain their design is very different; and their manner of expressing themselves is very proper to their design, and agreeable enough to the nature of languages, and especially of that they wrote in. And it can be no very strange thing to meet with words in books, as well as in common conversation, which seem to be used in a sense not literally true; and all ironies and hyperboles, and in general all the tropes and figures of speech which rhetoric teaches, are instances of it: and this you, to be sure, sir, so perfectly understand, that I need not enlarge. But to illustrate it by one plain example in our own tongue; be pleased only to observe it is common with us to say, such a fact or report ‘stains a man’s reputation.’ Nevertheless this is not true in the letter, nor would we be understood as if it were, reputation not being capable of a literal stain; we only mean to signify by this elliptical simile, (the word *stain* giving occasion to supply what is suppressed,) that as stains on linen, or any thing white, take from its beauty and clearness; so ill reports, &c., lessen and impair the purity of a man’s reputation, and are to it what stains are to clean linen. And thus, notwithstanding this phrase be not true in the letter, yet the word *stain* does not in the least change, but retain its signification; and the sense of the phrase is to be supplied, as the word *stain* directs, by filling up the similitude, as I have just now done, or else in that shorter manner I before shewed, when I spoke of Homer, by inserting ‘as it were,’ and then it will run thus: ‘This or the other thing does as it were stain a man’s reputation.’

This is readily brought home to the case in hand. I proceed therefore to add further, that it may not be amiss to make a distinction between the sense of a phrase, as it includes words not expressed; and the sense of the particular words singly considered, just as they stand: for by this distinction, the same sentence may and may not be literally true at the same time. The literal sense of a word, I call the obvious natural sense it has by common consent and custom; for words are merely arbitrary signs of ideas in our mind, and come to signify, properly and literally, this or that by agreement only, and therefore are to be regulated by nothing else.

It is just the same with regard to particular phrases; for words ranged in such an order and construction express this or the other



sense by mutual consent and use. Though the words therefore, as they stand, are used and joined together improperly; yet the whole phrase is nevertheless literally understood to be true, if it signifies what it is constantly used to express, which is the case of all proverbial sentences and figurative constructions. The foregoing example in our mother tongue, of *staining a man's reputation*, will make this plainer. That only which is expressed contains indeed the literal sense of the words; but this making of itself no perfect sense, together with what is to be understood and supplied, is the literal and complete sense of the phrase: for though it is but partially expressed, yet the rest is necessarily implied and hinted to us; the occasion, and common use, together with the words which are expressed, actually raising in our minds that part which, on these accounts, it was not so necessary to set down at large, and therefore might safely be omitted: and the idea which is thus necessarily raised in the mind is the direct natural, and consequently the literal sense of the phrase.

I am inclined to believe in general, it is a mistake to suppose words have more than one signification; and that words or sentences are probably never to be understood, but in their literal sense. And though it be true, that sentences sometimes are not to be taken according to the letter of those words only which are expressed, yet those words can by no means be supposed to lose or alter their sense, and receive a new one; but the true full sense, which is there elliptically expressed, is to be made up, as the literal sense of the words used, and common custom, &c. shall direct.

But I have dwelt too long, perhaps, on these things, and might have spared my remarks to you, sir, who have read with so much penetration and care the works of that excellent philosopher, the late ingenious Mr. Locke, and what he has so judiciously written in the third book of his *Essay on Human Understanding*, concerning the nature and use of words and languages, by which you are undoubtedly raised above my remarks. But I judged it convenient to recall these things to your mind, though you might know them before; and to acquaint you, that I believe these observations, fairly applied, will remove the imaginary difficulty of proving βαπτίζω signifies only *to dip* or *put into*, &c. and that no single instance can be produced to the contrary.

Before I dismiss this matter, I will render what I design, by distinguishing between the literal sense of the words, and the literal sense of the whole phrase, more obvious. I proposed to shew by it, that in reality these and all such passages, whatever may be fancied



to the contrary, are to be understood literally, and according to the strict proper sense of the words. For though taking the words as they stand, they cannot be true, nor indeed have any sense at all; as to talk of dipping a thing that is not capable of being dipped, is nonsense: yet taking the same words to be, as common use has made them, an ellipsis; it is but supplying the other words which are included, and the sense and construction become very easy; and it appears the whole phrase, and every particular word, is to be understood literally.

I think it plainly enough follows from all, that words, even in figurative constructions, are to be understood literally; and that in these, and all such like passages, βάπτω, βαπτίζω, &c., signify nothing else but *to dip*, &c. However, if, notwithstanding all I have said, you should believe I have not wholly taken away the supposed difficulty, yet since these observations must be allowed applicable to the cases in dispute, and fairly explain and unravel the meaning of these and all such forms of speech in so easy and feasible a manner, it is an unavoidable inference;

1. That these instances, which sincerely I think as good as any that can be brought against us, have no force at all: for the easy rational account I have given of them will go far enough at least to render them so obscure and doubtful as to be no counter-proof; and I am persuaded every impartial antagonist will own they carry the point much further, and are strongly on my side. And,

2. That my assertion remains in full force, notwithstanding those instances which may be offered to the contrary; and if so, then it is easy to see on which side the advantage lies: for these doubtful obscure passages, at most, are all the strength our adversaries have; whereas we, on the contrary, have a greater number of such as are clear and infallible, where the word can only signify, *to dip*, which I shall now go on to prove.

Aristophanes, for I have not yet done with him, though he may perhaps seem to give room for some men to cavil in one place or two, which nevertheless you see how fully we are able to account for, affords us convincing instances, that he thought the true signification of the word was only *to dip*. In his hated comedy of *The Clouds*, designed, with too much success, to expose and ridicule the great Socrates, the philosopher is supposed gravely to busy himself, in computing how many times the distance between two of its legs a flea sprung at one leap; and in order to measure the distance between the two legs, one of his pupils is made to describe him using this method: ‘He first melts a piece of wax, and then taking

‘the flea, he dipped (ἐρέβαψεν) two of its feet into its,’ &c. The other part of this ridiculous experiment is nothing to our purpose, and therefore I omit it.

Another passage you have in his play, entitled Peace, ‘Bring me ‘hither the torch,’ says one, ‘and I will dip it, ἐμβάψω<sup>b</sup>.’ To understand this it will be necessary to observe the poet introduces some persons about to sacrifice to the goddess Peace; and, among other ceremonies, he mentions this of the torch as one: now if you please to remember, sir, the ancient manner of purifying among the Grecians, by a lighted torch, you will grant it was performed by dipping the torch in water, and so sprinkling the persons or things concerned; and it is to this effect the Greek scholiast explains it, as does Florent. Christianus in his note on this place, who was the learned preceptor to Henry IV. of France, and is honoured with a very handsome eulogy by the admirable M. De Thou<sup>i</sup>.

There is another passage in Aristophanes very strong to the same purpose, which however some perhaps may fancy favours the contrary: it is in his Parliament of Women. ‘First,’ says he, ‘they wash (βάπτουσι) or dip the wool in warm water, according to old ‘customs.’ Here the word implies *washing*, as Mr. Wall would have it; and no doubt if he knows of this place, he thinks it mightily for his purpose, and especially if he has but found that Suidas<sup>m</sup> and Phavorinus<sup>n</sup> interpret it by πλέρουσι, which Pliny on another occasion renders *eluant*, i. e. *they wash out*; and Stephens<sup>o</sup> says it signified *lavo*, and is peculiarly spoken of garments, &c. as λούω is of the body, and νίπτω of the hands and feet. These things may seem of great force, and please Mr. Wall, it may be, and a great many more; but I believe you understand this better, sir, than to lay any stress upon it. Mr. Wall indeed finds ‘the sacramental washing is ‘expressed by words, which signify washing in the ordinary and ‘general sense<sup>p</sup>;’ and therefore he infers, *baptize* is not to be limited in its signification to *dip* only; much more then will he insist on this of Aristophanes, which in itself plainly speaks of washing, and is by the Greek lexicographers interpreted by a word which is always so used. But you must needs perceive, sir, instead of prejudicing, this will be found greatly to confirm my cause; for in

κ Κηρὸν διατήξας, εἶτα τὴν ψάλλαν λαβὼν,  
ἐνέβαψεν εἰς τὸν κηρὸν αὐτὸς τὰ πόδε.

Nubes, 149.

h φέρε δὴ, τὸ δαδὶον τόδ’ ἐμβάψω λαβὼν.  
Pax, 959.

i [See Thuanus’ History, book 117, at the year 1596.—Vol. v. p. 643. of the folio edition, London, 1733.]

κ . . . . . Πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ τάρια  
βάπτουσ. θερμῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν νόμον.  
Eccles. 215.

m Ad voc. βάπτουσι.

n Page 352.

o Ad voc. πλύνω.

p Part ii. p. 220. [537.]

washing, wool is and must be dipped and put into the water; and that this is the sense of the word here, I appeal even to Suidas and Phavorinus, whose gloss I am very well pleased with.

For though πλύνω (from whence perhaps comes our English word *plunge*) does signify to wash, it is so far from excluding, that it necessarily implies *dipping*; and accordingly we see it is appropriated to clothes, &c., which are dipped into the water when they are washed. Homer has a verse very clear to this effect, where πλύνειν is explained, εἶματ' ἄγεσθαι ἐς ποταμόν, 'to carry and put them into 'the river';' and a little after<sup>r</sup>, he describes their manner of washing by a word which expresses the fullers' custom, says Stephens, of treading things in the water; στέιβον, ἐπάτουν, says Pseudo-Didymus, ἐν βόθροισι, 'they tread them in great stone basins,' and they must certainly then be first put into the water; agreeable with this, πλύντρια is a washerwoman, or laundress, in Pollux. It appears now plainly enough from all this, that if the word does signify *to wash* here, it is only *ex consequenti*, and means such a washing as implies *dipping*, and is performed by it; and therefore this can be of no service to Mr. Wall, unless to convince him of his mistake.

Besides these passages, Harpocration<sup>s</sup> has preserved a fragment of one of Aristophanes' comedies, which are lost; the words are these: 'When I have dipped, I will cite the stranger before the 'judges<sup>t</sup>.' This passage would have been very obscure, and I do not know whether any thing would have given light to it, if Suidas had not attempted it; for I take this to be the passage he refers to, when he says, 'When I have dipped the oar<sup>q</sup>, &c., which helps us to the sense of the word βάψας in this place, though it does not clear up the whole; or perhaps, says he, 'it may be a metaphor taken from 'the dyers, who say, for instance, I will dip it, and make it a black.'

Athenæus has preserved two other fragments of the same author, in which this word occurs; one is, 'What a wretch am I, to be thus 'dipped over head and ears (ἀπεβάφθῃ) in brine like a pickled 'herring!' I know nothing of the occasion of these words, and therefore can only say in general, the sense of the word ἀπεβάφθῃ seems apparent enough. The other fragment is more obscure, and I cannot determine the word by any circumstances to one side or the other, and for that reason I omit it.

I will now bring you an instance or two from Aristotle, who

<sup>q</sup> Odys. ζ'. v. 58.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. v. 92.

<sup>s</sup> Ad voc. Ναυτοδίκας.

<sup>t</sup> Εξ Δαιταλεῦσιν. \*Ἐθελον βάψας πρὸς

Ναυτοδίκας ξέγην ἐξαφνης.

<sup>u</sup> Βάψας τὴν κώπην ἐπλευσας, ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς Ναυτοδίκας, &c. [in voce βάψας.]



abounds with them; but a few may suffice. In his Treatise of the Soul, lib. iii. cap. 12, he says, 'If a man dips (βάψειε) any thing into 'wax, as far as it is dipped, it is moved<sup>a</sup>.' Here it is impossible to question the meaning of the word, any more than in these following instances; as where he says a certain sort of fish 'cannot bear any 'great alterations, for example, to be put into (βάπτουσιν) a colder 'water in summer<sup>y</sup>;' and that the flux in elephants is cured, 'by 'giving them warm water to drink, and hay dipped (βάπτοντες) in 'honey to eat<sup>z</sup>.' Again, speaking of a kind of serpent bred in Africa, he says, those who are bit by it use for a remedy a certain 'stone found in the sepulchre of one of their ancient kings, which 'they put into (ἀποβάψαντες) the wine they drink<sup>a</sup>.' In another place he mentions a pool of Sicily (of the same nature with the lake Agnano, near the Grotto del Cani, in the neighbourhood of Naples) 'into which if birds and other animals are put, (ἀποβαφῆ,) after 'they are strangled, they immediately recover<sup>b</sup>.' He says also, 'It 'is the custom of some nations, in order to harden their children, to 'dip them (ἀποβάπτειν) into cold water, soon after they are born<sup>c</sup>.' These passages are so very plain, they want no illustration.

But there is another place in this author, and I remember no other in all his works, which may seem to have some difficulty in it, and therefore I will be so fair as to mention it. Speaking of several strange narrations, he says, 'The Phœnicians, who 'inhabit Cadiz, relate, that sailing beyond Hercules' pillars, in 'four days, with the wind at east, they came to a land unin- 'habited, whose coast was full of sea-weeds, and is not laid under 'water (βαπτίζεσθαι) at ebb; but when the tide comes in, it is 'wholly covered and overwhelmed<sup>d</sup>.' Βαπτίζεσθαι being used here to signify the land was under water, by the waters coming in upon it, and not by its being put into the water, some perhaps may think it a considerable objection; but it will be found of no advantage to our adversaries, if it be observed, that it here necessarily and

<sup>x</sup> Εἰ εἰς κηρὸν βάψειε τις, μέχρι τούτου ἐκινήθη, ὥς ἔβαψε.

<sup>y</sup> Hist. Animal. lib. viii. ch. 2. fin. Καὶ τὰς μεταβολὰς δ' οὐχ ὑπομένουσι τὰς ἰσχυρὰς, οἷον καὶ τοῖς θέρουσιν ἐὰν βάπτωσιν εἰς ψυχρὸν.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. ch. 26. Καὶ τὸν χόρτον εἰς μέλι βάπτοντες, διδάσιν ἐσθίειν, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. ch. 29. Οὐδὲ καὶ λέγεται ἄκος εἶναι λίθος τις, ὃν λαμβάνουσιν ἀπὸ τάφου βασιλέως τῶν ἀρχαίων, καὶ ἐν οἴῳ ἀποβάψαντες, πίνουσι.

<sup>b</sup> De Mirabil. Auscult. non longe ab initio. Περὶ Σικελίαν δὲ φασιν εἶναι ὕδατος συστρεμμάτιον, εἰς δὲ τὰ πεπνιγμένα τῶν

ὀρνέων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων ὅταν ἀποβαφῆ, πάλιν ἀναβιοῖ. [c. 29.]

<sup>c</sup> De Republic. lib. vii. c. 17. init. Διὸ παρὰ πολλοῖς ἐστὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἔθος τοῖς μὲν εἰς ποταμὸν ἀποβάπτειν τὰ γιγνόμενα ψυχρὸν, &c.

<sup>d</sup> De Mirabil. Auscult. Λέγουσι περὶ Φοίνικας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὰ Γάδειρα καλούμενα, ἔξω πλέοντας Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν ἀπηλιώτῃ ἀνέμφῃ ἡμέρας τέτταρας, παραγίνεσθαι εἰς τινὰς τόπους ἐρήμους, θρύου καὶ φύκους πληρεῖς, οὓς ὅταν μὲν ζυμωτῆς ἢ μὴ βαπτίζεσθαι, ὅταν δὲ πλημμύρα, κατακλύζεσθαι, &c. [c. 136.]



unavoidably imports to be under water, or to be overwhelmed or covered with water; which no way suits our English pædobaptists, but is very agreeable with what the antipædobaptists, and the whole Greek church, (which one would imagine should understand the force of the word,) at this day continue to practise; and this being the plain sense of this place, it is natural enough to say, *as it were*, or *in a manner*, or some such expression is to be understood.

Besides, the word βαπτίζω, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it; though indeed to put it into the water is the most natural way and the most common, and is therefore usually and pretty constantly, but it may be not necessarily, implied. However that be, the place makes nothing at all for our adversaries; and therefore, as they will not insist on it, I will dismiss it, when I have desired you, if you believe there is any difficulty remaining, to consider it impartially, and examine it by the rules I laid down for understanding metaphorical, elliptical, &c. forms of speech.

Heraclides Ponticus, a disciple of Aristotle's, may help us also in fixing the sense of the word; for moralizing the fable of Mars' being taken in a net by Vulcan, he says, 'Neptune is ingeniously supposed to deliver Mars from Vulcan, to signify, that when a piece of iron is taken red-hot out of the fire, and put into the water, (βαπτίζε-  
'ται,) the heat is repelled and extinguished by the contrary nature of the water<sup>e</sup>.'

I should have quoted Herodotus before, but having somehow or other forgot him in his proper place, give me leave to transcribe a passage or two out of him here. In the fourth book of his History, describing the customs of the Scythians; 'Always,' says he, 'when they conclude an alliance with any one, they ratify it in this manner: they fill a large earthen vessel with wine, and mingle into it blood drawn from each party, by making an incision in their flesh with a sword; into this they dip a scimitar, some arrows, a pole-axe, and a javelin, and then with many horrid imprecations, they who treat the league, and the chief persons of the company, drink up the mixture<sup>f</sup>.' In another place, speaking largely of the cus-

<sup>e</sup> Allegor. p. 495. Ποσειδῶν δ' ὁ ῥυόμενος παρ' Ἡφαίστου τὸν Ἄρη, πιθανῶς. Ἐπειδὴ περ ἐκ τῶν βαναύσων διάπυρος ὁ τοῦ σιδήρου μύδρος ἔλκυσθὲις, ὕδατι βαπτίζεται, καὶ τὸ φλογῶδες ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως ὕδατι κατασβεθὲν ἀναπαύεται.

<sup>f</sup> Melpomen. p. 154. Ὅρκια δὲ ποιέονται Σκύθαι ὧδε, πρὸς τοὺς ἂν ποιεῶνται· ἐς κύλικα μεγάλην κεραμίνην οἶνον ἐγχέαντες, αἷμα συμμίσχουσιν τῶν τὰ ὅρκια ταμινομένων, τύψαντες, ὁπέατι ἢ ἐπιταμόντες μαχαίρῃ σμικρὴν τοῦ σώματος· καὶ ἔπειτα ἀποβάψαντες ἐς τὴν

toms and antiquities of the Ægyptians, he says, ‘Swine are counted ‘such unclean beasts among them, that if an Ægyptian does but ‘touch one in passing, he runs to the river, and dips (ἐβαψε) himself ‘in it, with his clothes.’

Theocritus<sup>b</sup> uses the word in the same manner, when he says, ‘Every morning, instead of water, my maid shall dip me (βάψαι) a ‘cup of honey;’ that is, shall fill me a cup of honey. Here βάψαι implies her dipping the cup into some large vessel of honey, and can signify neither to *wash* nor *pour*, &c., nor any thing else but *dip*.

As again, where he says, ‘the lad let down a mighty pitcher, and ‘made haste to dip it, (βάψαι,) viz. in the water.’

Moschus, cautioning against Cupid’s treacheries and arrows, says, ‘They are deceitful all, and presents dipped (βέβηπται) in fire:’ that is, as some nations usually dip their arrows in the rankest poisons, to render the wounds they give incurable; so Cupid’s are, as it were, dipped in fire, to create pain and anguish.

As near as I can remember, most of the instances which follow are plain and easy, like those immediately preceding; so that I shall but just mention them, (except when I come to Callimachus,) and add no exposition. If this prove tiresome and insipid, you cannot censure me, since you have engaged me to give you so particular an account of the word, which could not be done without being tiresome both to yourself and me.

I do not know whether Aratus, in his *Phænomena*, uses the word above three times. One is in describing the setting of the constellation Cepheus, in the latitude of about sixty-nine or seventy degrees, where he calls it, ‘dipping, (βάπτων,) or plunging his upper ‘parts into the sea.’ And the Latins frequently interpret the word, as Ovid does<sup>l</sup>, by *mergo* in these cases. And again, giving that same rule for judging of the weather, which our Lord mentions, Matt. xvi. 2, Aratus says, ‘But if the sun dips (βάπτει) himself ‘without a cloud into the western sea<sup>m</sup>,’ &c. Lastly, repeating

κύλικα ἀκινάκεια, καὶ ὀστροὺς, καὶ σάγαριν,  
καὶ ἀκόντιον. ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα ποιήσωσι, κατ-  
εύχονται πολλὰ. καὶ ἔπειτα ἀποπίνουσι αὐτοὶ  
τε οἱ τὸ ὄρκιον ποιούμενοι, καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων  
οἱ πλείστου ἄξιοι. [lib. IV. c. 70.]

<sup>ε</sup> Euterpe, p. 68. Ἔν δὲ Αἰγύπτῳ μιᾶρὸν  
ἡγήνται θηρίον εἶναι, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν, ἦν τις  
ψαύσῃ αὐτῶν παριῶν ἐὸς, αὐτοῖσι ἱματίοισι  
ἀπ’ ὧν ἔβαψε ἑωυτὸν, βάς ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν.  
[II. c. 47.]

<sup>h</sup> ..... καὶ τὸ ποτ’ ὕρθρον  
ἀ παῖς ἀνθ’ ὕδατος τὰν κάλπιδα κηρία βάψαι. Idyll. V. 126.

<sup>i</sup> Ἦτοι ὁ κοῦρος ἐπεῖχε ποτῶ πολυχανδέα κρωσσὸν  
βάψαι ἐπειγόμενος. Idyll. XIII. 46.

<sup>k</sup> ..... τὰ μὲν εἰς κεφαλὴν μάλα πάντα  
ἐάπτων ὠκεανόοι. V. 650.

<sup>l</sup> Ante tamen quam summa dies spectacula sistat,  
Ensifer Orion æquore mersus erit. Fast. IV. 80.

<sup>m</sup> Εἰδ’ ὁ μὲν ἀνέφελος βάπτει ῥόον ἐσπερίοιο, &c. V. 858.

more prognostications of the weather, 'If the crow dips (ἐβάψατο) 'his head into the river'<sup>n</sup>,' &c.

My opinion is confirmed also by Callimachus, in his hymns, when he says 'Ye Grecian waterwomen,' (they furnished private houses with water, as some do among us,) 'dip not your vessels in the 'river Inachus to-day<sup>o</sup>.' The hymn was made on the solemnizing the festival of washing the statue of Pallas; which ceremony was performed by persons set apart for that purpose, in the river Inachus, a little before day; from this river the inhabitants were usually supplied with water, which makes the poet, in veneration to the goddess, charge the water-women here not to dip their pitchers in the river on that day. This is clearly the sense, and therefore they who have translated it by *lavate*, 'wash,' consonant with Mr. Wall's notion of the word, are grossly mistaken: and I wonder Theodorus Grævius, who began, and his incomparable father, who completed, the late curious edition of this author, have left this fault untouched; especially if they were timely enough possessed of that immense treasury, the illustrious baron Spanheim's Remarks on Callimachus, who particularly corrects this error, with great solidity of argument. Politian too had rendered it very justly by *tingite*, 'dip,' and did not deserve the censure of that honourable critic, though indeed he has treated him with his usual decency and mildness; for as baron Spanheim himself notes, the old scholiast on Nicander, who has used the word just in the same manner as Callimachus here does, interprets it by γέμιζε, which signifies *to fill*; and this must be done by dipping. This, if possible, is still more evident from the passage I just now cited from Theocritus, 'The boy let 'down his mighty pitcher in haste to dip it<sup>p</sup>.' And Aristophanes expresses the same sense, though on another occasion, thus; 'With 'pitchers fetch me water from the river<sup>q</sup>.' And so Aristotle uses αἶρειν, on the like occasion, *Quæst. Mechanic.* c. 29. And Constantine observes from an epigram of Hermolaus, ἐς ὕδατα κρωσσὸν ἔβαψε, 'He dipped his pitcher in the water.' The mysterious Lycophron affords us an instance parallel to this in Callimachus; 'dipping ' (βάψαντας) with strange and foreign buckets<sup>r</sup>:' and Canterus renders the word here by *tingentes*, as Politian has done in Callimachus, which is certainly the true and literal sense. And the Greek

<sup>n</sup> Ἦπον καὶ ποταμοῖο ἐβάψατο μέχρι παρ' ἄκρους

<sup>o</sup> Ὀμους ἐκ κεφαλῆς, &c. V. 951.

<sup>p</sup> Σάμερον ὕδροφόροι μὴ βάπτετε. In *Lavacr. Pallad.* v. 45.

<sup>q</sup> Ἦτοι δ' κοῦρος ἐπέιχε ποτῶ πολυχανδέα κρωσσὸν

Βάψαι ἐπειγόμενος. *Idyll.* XIII. 46.

<sup>r</sup> Κάλπισί τ' ἐκ ποταμῶν δρόσον ἄρατε. *Ran. Act.* 5. *Scen.* 2.

<sup>r</sup> Κρωσσοῖσιν ὕθνεοισι βάψαντας γάνος. *Cassandr.* v. 1365.

scholiast on Euripides, who uses the word likewise exactly to the same purpose, in the place above cited, says expressly, as I there transcribed him<sup>s</sup>, ‘βάπτειν signifies to let or put down into water;’ and yet at the same time he interprets βάψασα, *dipping*, (Euripides’ word,) by γέμισασα, *filling*; which shews he understood it in that and other such places to signify, *to fill by dipping*.

To this may be added what Aristotle says in his Mechanical Questions<sup>t</sup>, ‘The bucket must be first let down, or dipped (βάψαι),’ and then be drawn up again,’ viz. when it is full. When his excellency, therefore, corrects Politian, and renders the word here by *haurite*, as Scaliger has done that in Lycophron by *haurientes*; he is not to be supposed to mean it does not signify *to dip*, in that place, but only that the Latin *tingo* does not so fully and properly express the poet’s sense as *haurio* does; and so though *tingo*, by a metalepsis, is the true sense of βάπτω, (for as Vossius remarks<sup>u</sup>, ‘Immersion’ is before tinging, for things are tinged by it,) yet *haurio* is more proper when we speak of drawing or taking up water out of a river. Ovid uses it thus; Fastor. lib. iv.

‘Et manibus puram fluminis hausit aquam.’

‘And with her hands she scooped the crystal flood.’

In this passage it is obvious, that by ‘manibus aquam haurire,’ he must necessarily mean, ‘to take up water in the hands, by dipping’ them into it:’ and so the phrase includes dipping, as undoubtedly those great men designed it should, when they translated βάπτω by *haurio*, as the aptest Latin word, and exactly in the same sense as Ovid here uses it.

A thing of this nature, and so evident, did not indeed need to have been so largely treated as it has already been: but the unaccountable tenacity of our antagonists, together with your commands, have made it necessary to be very particular, and therefore I must proceed to add some few instances more.

Dionysius Halicarnassæus, describing the warm duel between Aruns and Brutus, has this expression<sup>x</sup>; ‘One thrust his spear’ (βάψας) between the other’s ribs, who at the same instant pushed ‘his into his enemy’s belly.’ In the life of Homer, which that excellent philologist Dr. Gale has proved<sup>y</sup> to have been written by

<sup>s</sup> Βάπτειν ἐστὶ τὸ χαλᾶν τι εἰς ὕδωρ, ἢ εἰς ἕτερον τι ὑγρὸν.

<sup>t</sup> Cap. 29. Βάψαι γὰρ δεῖ, καὶ τοῦτ’ ἄνω ἐλκύσαι.

<sup>u</sup> Etymolog. ad voc. Baptismus. Posterior est immersione tinctura, quia hæc

immersione fit.

<sup>x</sup> Antiq. Rom. lib. v. p. 278. ‘Ὁ μὲν εἰς τὰς πλευρὰς βάψας τὴν αἰχμὴν, ὃ δὲ εἰς τὰς λαγόνas.

<sup>y</sup> Præfat. ad Opuscul. Mythologic.



this Dionysius, we have a very remarkable passage. The biographer is pointing out some of the innumerable beauties in Homer's incomparable poems, and takes notice particularly of one in the sixteenth Iliad, v. 333, where Ajax is described killing Cleobulus<sup>z</sup>: 'He struck him across the neck with his heavy sword: and the whole sword became warm with the blood,' says the poet. By which is emphatically expressed, how much the sword was dipped in (ἐβαπτίσθη), (as Pseudo-Didymus explains it,) and wet with blood. And Dionysius' words, for the sake of which I mention this, are these<sup>a</sup>: 'In that phrase, Homer expresses himself with the greatest energy, signifying, that the sword was so dipped (βαπτισθέντος) in blood, that it was even heated by it.'

Strabo is very plain in several instances: speaking of the lake near Agrigentum, a town on the south shore of Sicily, now called Gergenti, he says, 'Things which otherwise will not swim do not sink (βαπτίζεσθαι) in the water of this lake, but float like wood<sup>b</sup>.' And there is a rivulet in the south parts of Cappadocia, he tells us, 'whose waters are so buoyant, that if an arrow is thrown in, it will hardly sink or be dipped (βαπτίζεσθαι) into them<sup>c</sup>.' Again, speaking of the daring attempt of Alexander at Phaselis, at the foot of Climax, a mountain in Lycia, between which and the sea the passage is very narrow, he observes, that at high-water, and especially in winter, at which time Alexander was there, it is overflowed by the sea; but notwithstanding, the king, impatient of delays, led on his army, and 'the soldiers marched a whole day through the water, dipped (βαπτίζομένων) up to the waist<sup>d</sup>.' In another place, ascribing the fabulous properties of the Asphaltites to the lake Sirbon, he says, 'the bitumen floats a-top, because of the nature of that water, which admits no diving; for if a man goes into it, he cannot sink, or be dipped, (βαπτίζεσθαι,) but is forcibly kept above<sup>e</sup>.' Take one instance more from this author, who a little after, in the same book, mentions a sort of wild Arabs, whom he calls elephantophagi, or elephant-eaters; some of whom, among other artifices, he tells you they made use of to catch the elephant,

<sup>z</sup> — Πλήξας ξίφει αὐχένα κωπήεντι  
Πᾶν δ' ὑπερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι.—

<sup>a</sup> Vit. Homer. p. 297. Πᾶν δ' ὑπερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ παρέχει μείζονα ἔμφασιν, ὥς βαπτισθέντος οὕτω τοῦ ξίφους ὥς τε θερμανθῆναι.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. vi. p. 421. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἀκολύμβοις βαπτίζεσθαι συμβαίνει, ξύλων τρόπον ἐπιπολάζουσιν.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. xii. p. 809. Τῷ δὲ καθιέντι ἀκόντιον ἄνωθεν εἰς τὸν βόθρον, ἢ βία τοῦ ὕδατος

ἀντιπράττει τοσοῦτον, ὥστε μόλις βαπτίζεσθαι.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. xiv. p. 982. Καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδασι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη, μέχρι ὀμφαλοῦ βαπτίζομένων.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. xvi. p. 1108. Εἴτ' ἐπιπολάζουσα διὰ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ ὕδατος ἦν ἔφαμεν, μηδὲ κολύμβου δεῖσθαι, μηδὲ βαπτίζεσθαι τὸν ἐμβάντα, ἀλλ' ἐξαιρεσθαι.

‘kill him with arrows dipped (βεβαμμένοις) in the gall of serpents<sup>f</sup>.’

Plutarch, in his treatise concerning the education of children, advises not to overtask them; and adds: ‘I have known some fathers, who, through excessive fondness, have not truly loved their children at all. To make myself better understood by an instance: being eager to have their children early admired, and excel in all things, they lay burdens on them that bear no proportion to their strength, and only serve to oppress and jade them. And when they are thus fatigued, it is impossible their minds should improve: for as plants thrive and flourish when they are moderately watered, but wither and pine away if you drench them too much; so the mind, if moderately exercised with labours proportionable to its abilities, grows more vigorous; but too much toil (βαπτίζεται) as it were drowns and overwhelms it<sup>g</sup>.’

If this passage should seem to be a little obscure, I must refer you, sir, to what I have said before, which will effectually take away all the difficulty, and which I need not repeat. But I will give another instance from Plutarch, that shall be evident enough. Relating the stratagem of a Roman general a little before he died of his wound he says, that ‘he set up a trophy, on which, having dipped (βαπτίσας) his hand in blood, he wrote this inscription<sup>h</sup>,’ &c.

I have almost tired myself, and will mention but two or three places more. Take one from Lucian; who describing the cruel, inhuman disposition of Timon, that monstrous Athenian, who bore a professed inconceivable hatred to human kind, makes him express himself thus: ‘Should I see any one,’ says he, ‘in the midst of raging flames, just ready to take hold on him; and should he earnestly beg me to put out the fire, I would pour on pitch and oil: if a man were hurried down a rapid stream, and with outstretched hands cried to me for help, I would thrust him down when sinking (βαπτίζοντα); he never should rise again<sup>i</sup>.’

<sup>f</sup> Lib. xvi. p. 1117. Τίνες δὲ καὶ τοξεύμασιν ἀναιροῦσιν αὐτοὺς χολῇ βεβαμμένοις ὕφρων ὀιστοῖς.

<sup>g</sup> Page 15. Ἦδη δὲ τινὰς ἐγὼ εἶδον πατέρας οἷς τὸ λίαν φιλεῖν τοῦ μὴ φιλεῖν αἴτιον κατέστη. τί οὖν ἐστὶν δὲ βούλομαι λέγειν; ἵνα τῇ παραδείγματι φωτεινότερον ποιήσω τὸν λόγον. σπεύδοντες γὰρ τοὺς παῖδας ἐν πᾶσι τάχιστα πρωτεύσαι, πόνοις αὐτοῖς ὑπερμέτρους ἐπιβάλλουσιν, οἷς ἀπαυδῶντες ἐμπίπτουσι, καὶ ἄλλως βαρυνόμενοι ταῖς κακοπαθείαις, οὐ δέχονται τὴν μάθησιν εὐνήως.

ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ φυτὰ τοῖς μὲν μετρίοις ὕδασι τρέφεται, τοῖς δὲ πόλλοις πρίγεται, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ψυχὴ τοῖς μὲν συμμέτροις αἰχεται πόνοις, τοῖς δ’ ὑπερβάλλουσι βαπτίζεται.

<sup>h</sup> Parall. Græc. Rom. p. 545. Καὶ εἰς τὸ αἷμα τὴν χεῖρα βαπτίσας, ἔστησε τρόπιον ἐπιγράφας, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Lucian, vol. i. p. 139. Εἰ δὲ τινὰ ἴδοιμι ἐν πυρὶ διαφθειρόμενον, καὶ σβεννύναι ἱκετεύοντα, πίττη καὶ ἐλαίῳ κατασβεννύναι· καὶ ἥν τινα τοῦ χειμῶνος ὁ ποταμὸς παραφέρῃ, ὁ

The pious emperor Marcus Antoninus, in his admirable *Meditations*, uses the word whose sense we are settling, several times; but I think always metaphorically; so that, indeed, it is not very fair to argue from those passages. However, lest my adversaries should imagine they make against me, I will touch upon them.

In the third book, he draws the character of such an one as he thinks may be reckoned a man of true merit; and says, he 'is not 'to be corrupted with pleasures, nor broken by misfortunes; 'unmoved with calumnies and slanders; a conqueror in that noble 'strife of mastering and subduing the passions, and (*βεβαμμένον*) 'dipped, as it were, in, or swallowed up with justice<sup>k</sup>;' that is, perfectly just; as we say, persons given up to their pleasures and vices, are immersed in, or swallowed up with, pleasures or wickedness. So it is in 1 Tim. vi. 9. *They that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.* Again the imperial moralist says, 'Such as the thoughts are which you are most possessed with, 'such will your mind be; for the thoughts (*βάπτεται*) dip or tincture the mind; (*βάπτει*) dip or tincture it therefore by accustoming 'yourself to such thoughts as these<sup>l</sup>,' &c. In the sixth book, and I think the word occurs no oftener in all these noble meditations, the emperor says, 'Do not make the former emperors the pattern of 'your actions, lest (*βαφῆς*) you are infected or stained<sup>m</sup>,' or as it were dipped and dyed, viz. in mistakes or vices. The period is extremely elliptical, and stands in need of these or such supplements to make out the sense in another language, wherein that defective form is not in use.

I do not see any advantage our adversaries can possibly pretend to from these or any the like passages: that they are metaphorical none can question; nor, in my opinion, can it be doubted but they necessarily allude to, and imply *dipping*; for only in that sense of the word can the metaphor be justified, which, according to Cicero's rule<sup>n</sup>, is natural, and not too licentious.

But to pass this, I would only note, that Plato, in his admirable

δὲ, τὰς χεῖρας ὑρέγων, ἀντιλαβέσθαι δέηται, ὥθειν καὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν βαπτίζοντα, ὥς μὴ δὲ ἀνακύψαι δυνηθείη.

<sup>k</sup> Section iv. p. 17. Τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄχραντον ἡδονῶν, ἁπρωτον ὑπὸ παντὸς πόνου, πάσης ὕβρεως ἀνέπαφον, πάσης ἀναίσθητον πονηρίας, ἀθλητὴν ἄθλου τοῦ μεγίστου, τοῦ ὑπὸ μηδενὸς πάθους καταβληθῆναι, δικαιοσύνη βεβαμμένον εἰς βάθος.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. v. sect. 16. p. 41. Οἷα ἂν πολλάκις φαντασθῆς, τοιαύτη σοι ἔσται ἡ διάνοια·

βάπτεται γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν φαντασιῶν ἡ ψυχὴ. βάπτε οὖν αὐτήν, τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῶν τοιοῦτων φαντασιῶν, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Sect. 30. pag. 52. "Ὅρα μὴ ἀποκαίσασθαι, μὴ βαφῆς.

<sup>n</sup> Ad Herenn. lib. iv. p. 57. Translatione pudentem esse oportere, ut cum ratione in consimilem rem transeat, ne sine delectu temere et cupide videatur in dissimilem transcurrisset.

commentaries concerning government, has pursued this metaphor very closely, and thereby shewn us the propriety of it, and how expressive it is; for which reason I will transcribe him at large.

‘The dyers when they are about to dip a quantity of wool to make it of a purple colour, cull out the whitest of the fleece, and prepare and work it with a world of trouble, that it may the better take the grain; and then they dip it (βάπτουσι). The dye of things thus dipped is lasting and unchangeable, and cannot be fetched out and tarnished, either by fair water, or any preparations for discharging of colours. But things which are not dyed after this manner, you know what they are; no matter what dye they are dipped in (βάπτῃ), they never look well; without this preparation they take but a nasty colour, and that is easily washed out too. And thus in like manner our choosing soldiers, and instructing them in music, and those exercises which consist in agility of body, you must imagine our design is only to make them the better receive the laws, which are a kind of dye, that their tempers being formed by a proper discipline may be fixed and unalterable by terror, &c., and (βαφὴν) their tincture may not be washed out by any medicaments of the most powerfully expelling nature; as pleasure, which is stronger to this effect than any lye, as is likewise grief, fear, or desire, and the like.’

The figure, you see, sir, is maintained quite through the passage, by applying the dyers’ terms to the things of the mind. I find Gataker also has transcribed this place a little more at large, together with several others from Seneca, &c., to the same effect, in his learned note on the words above cited, in the 4th section of Antoninus’ third book; which if you think it needful you may be pleased to turn to, for they considerably illustrate my assertion. But give me leave to add another passage much like the preceding one of Plato, which just comes into my mind; it is part of Lysis’ Epistle to Hipparchus, published by the learned Dr. Gale, in his

<sup>o</sup> Plato de Republica, lib. iv. p. 637. E. Οἱ βαφεῖς ἐπειδὴν βουλευθῶσι βάψαι ἔρια, ὥστε εἶναι ἀλουργὰ, πρῶτον μὲν ἐκλέγονται ἐκ τοσούτων χρωμάτων μίαν φύσιν τὴν τῶν λευκῶν· ἔπειτα προπαρασκευάζουσιν οὐκ ὀλίγη παρασκευὴν θεραπεύσαντες, ὥπως δέξονται ὅτι μάλιστα τὸ ἄνθος· καὶ οὕτω δὴ βάπτουσι· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἂν τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ βαφῇ δευσοποιὸν γίγνεται τὸ βαφέν. καὶ ἡ πλῆσις οὐτ’ ἂνεν ῥυμμάτων οὐτε μετὰ ῥυμμάτων δύναται αὐτῶν τὸ ἄνθος ἀφαιρεῖσθαι· ἃ δ’ ἂν μὴ, οἶσθα οἷα γίγνεται, ἕαν τέ τις ἄλλα χρώματα βάπτῃ, ἕαν τε καὶ ταῦτα μὴ προσθεραπεύσας· Οἶδα (ἔφη) ὅτι ἐκπλυτα

καὶ γελοῖα. τοιοῦτον τοίνυν ὑπόλαβε κατὰ δύναμιν ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ ἡμᾶς, ὅτε ἐξελεγχόμεθα τοὺς στρατιώτας καὶ ἐπαιδευόμεν μουσικῇ καὶ γυμναστικῇ· καὶ μηδὲν οἷον ἄλλο μηχανᾶσθαι, ἢ ὥπως ἡμῖν ὅτι κάλλιστα τοὺς νόμους πισθύνετε δέξοιντο, ὥσπερ βαφὴν ἵνα δευσοποιὸς αὐτῶν ἡ δόξα γίγναιτο καὶ περὶ δεινῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων· διὰ τὸ τὴν τε φύσιν καὶ τὴν τροφὴν ἐπιτηδεῖαν ἐσχηκέναι· καὶ μὴ αὐτῶν ἐκπλύναι τὴν βαφὴν τὰ ῥύμματα ταῦτα, δεινὰ ὄντα ἐκκλύζειν, ἢ τε ἡδονῇ, παντὸς χαλαστραίου δεινοτέρα οὖσα τοῦτο δρᾶν καὶ κονίας, λύπη, τε καὶ φόβος, καὶ ἐπιθυμία, παντὸς ἄλλου ῥύμματος.



Opuseula Mythologica; speaking of Pythagoras' method with his pupils, 'As dyers,' says he, 'first cleanse and wash clothes which are to be dyed, in some astringent, that so they may take a more durable colour; in like manner, that great man used to prepare such as came to learn of him,' &c. Mentioning of these metaphors gives me occasion to remember the words of Plutarch concerning Otho, whom Junius was soliciting Galba to nominate his successor in the empire; and though it is out of due order, as having dispatched Plutarch before, I will mention them here, the word βαπτίζω being used as figuratively as in the passage above; 'He was,' says Plutarch, 'over head and ears (βεβαπτισμένον) in debt'; which is exactly our English phrase.

Pollux, in the work he composed for the service of the emperor Commodus, to teach him to speak Greek correctly, puts βαπτίζεσθαι<sup>r</sup> for a ship's being sunk and totally immersed in the sea.

I will add but one instance more, which shall be out of Themistius; who says, 'The pilot cannot tell but he may save one in the voyage, that had better be drowned's,' (βαπτίσαι,) sunk into the sea.

Thus I put an end to my laborious task: you see, sir, how many examples I have produced, and I might easily enumerate as many more, from the authors I have named, and likewise from those I have wholly omitted; but I am wearied with heaping up dry sentences, only to get at the sense of a word, which I think sufficiently clear already, and altogether as plain of itself as any thing in the world can make it. Your expressly obliging me to this service is a very good excuse; and yet I can hardly forbear thinking I had need say something more, but that I consider it was apparently necessary to do as I have done, since some persons so confidently pretend, and withal so very unreasonably, that βαπτίζω does not always signify *to dip*; and among the rest Mr. Wall is one. He takes the liberty to say, 'Mr. Walker has largely shewn from the Greek authors, and lexicographers and critics, that besides the signification *immergo*, they give it that of *lavo* in general.' Whereas you see, sir, I have fully baffled all that is alleged from any

<sup>r</sup> Pag. 737. Καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ βαφεῖς προκαθαράντες ἐστύψαν τὰ βάψιμα τῶν ἱματίων, ὥπως ἀνέκπλυτον τὰν βαφὰν ἀναπλῶντι, καὶ μηδέποκα γενησομέναν ἐξίταλον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμόνιος τρόπον ἀνὴρ παρεσκεύαζε τὼς φιλοσοφίας ἐρασθέντας, ὥπως μὴ, &c.

<sup>q</sup> Moral. tom. iii. Galba, p. 1504. Καὶ πεντακισχίλιον μυριάδων ὀφλήμασι βεβα-

πτισμένον.

<sup>r</sup> Onomastic. lib. i. c. 9. Τὰ δὲ πάθη οὕτως ἂν εἴποις. χεϊμάζεσθαι, σαλεύειν, ὠθεῖσθαι, ἀπωθεῖσθαι, παρασύρεσθαι, συγκλύζεσθαι, κατασύρεσθαι, ἢ καταδύεσθαι, βαπτίζεσθαι, ἀνατρέπεσθαι, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Orat. iv. p. 133. Οὔτε δὲ κυβερνήτης, εἰ σώζεις ἐν τῷ πλῶ ὃν καὶ βαπτίσει ἄμεινον ἦν.

passages in the Grecian writers : as to lexicographers and critics, were it so material, I could easily prove him to be very much mistaken there also : the Greek lexicographers afford him no ground at all for his pretence ; and the most learned of the others, if they do interpret the word by *lavo*, do not mean, as he pretends, any washing in general, but only such as is performed by *dipping* : for they may render it well enough by *lavo*, the general word, which comprehends *mergo* the particular.

I know it signifies *to wash*, as a consequence of dipping ; but so likewise it does *to wet*, *colour*, *dye*, *brown*, and *to poison* : it also signifies to put on Christ, and to be buried with him, as the apostle himself teaches us. But what I have further to say I must leave to my next.

I am, &c.

---

#### LETTER IV.

CRITICS constantly affirm the proper and genuine sense of βαπτίζω is *immergo*, &c.—So Vossius, Constantine, and Stephanus render it—A testimony from Casaubon—His poor evasion—Another from Grotius—Another from Dionysius Petavius—It is needless to collect more—Mr. Wall conscious, notwithstanding his pretence, that the opinions of learned men are against him—Whereas Mr. Wall appeals to the Scriptures for the sense of the word, it is shewn largely to be never there used in his sense, but the contrary—Lev. xiv. 6. considered—That the word does not always necessarily signify to dip all over, is the most that can be inferred from it ; besides, here it means to dip all over. Isa. xxi. 4 ; Ezek. xxiii. 15 ; Dan. iv. 33. and v. 21. considered—Hot climates very dewy—The Syriac version confirms our sense—Ecclus. xxxi. 26 ; 2 Macc. i. 21 : Ecclus. xxxiv. 26. considered—The purification enjoined for touching that which is dead, to be performed by sprinkling—together with dipping—The Mahometans purify in such cases by washing all over—Washing was the main part of the purification among the Jews—For which reason the son of Sirach uses this word to intend the whole ceremony—Luke xi. 38. considered—Mr. Wall pretends the Jews always washed their hands, by having water poured on them : which is false—The priests washed their hands and feet by dipping them—Our LORD washed his disciples' feet so likewise—The authority of the rabbins not to be depended on—Dr. Pococke allows, the Jews were obliged sometimes to wash by dipping—And from thence accounts for the use of the word βαπτίζεσθαι, Mark vii. 4.—Mr. Wall's next instance, which is Mark vii. 4, considered—Those that came from the market did wash by dipping—Sects among the Jews who washed themselves frequently—The words may refer to the things brought from the market—Heb. ix. 10. and Matt. xxvi. 23. considered—The sacramental washing being expressed by words, which signify any kind of washing, does not prove it may therefore be administered by any kind of washing—Words, like our ideas, have their *genera* and *species*—Words of a more particular sense should explain the more general, and not the contrary.

SIR,

THE proper and genuine sense of βαπτίζω, the critics constantly affirm, is *immergo, mergo*, &c. Constantine almost always renders it so, and Stephens never fails to do it, and explains it to signify to *dye*, or *wash by dipping*<sup>a</sup>; till in another period he inclines to shew a little favour to the authority of the church and her practice, and to that end indeed interprets it by *lavo, abluo*, &c. But he confirms this exposition by no examples, except two from Scripture, Mark vii. 4. and Luke xi. 28, which we shall examine by and by, and some from the later ecclesiastical writers.

And yet, at the same time, he cannot forbear blaming such as use those words in relation to the Christian sacrament, and says expressly, 'That Tertullian rendered it more properly by *mergitare*, 'on account of the trine immersion in baptism, retaining what the 'grammarians call the frequentative termination<sup>b</sup>.'

The great Vossius speaks exactly to the same purpose, and indeed almost in the same words; for without ever taking the least notice of *lavo*, or the like, he expressly says<sup>c</sup>, 'Though βάπτω and βαπτίζω 'are rendered by *mergo* or *mergito*, and *tingo*, yet they properly signify *mergo* and *tingo* only by a metalepsis,' i. e. as *tingo* implies *mergo*; and therefore he adds, 'Tinging follows immersion, and is 'done by it<sup>d</sup>.' Also in his Treatise of Baptism, as well as here, he translates the Greek word by *mergo*, and says again that is its proper signification; and, farther than this, that particularly when it relates to the Christian sacrament, it should of choice be rendered by *mergito*; as you may see in his *Etymologicon* at the word *baptismus*.

Casaubon, no inconsiderable judge in matters of this nature, is very express in his note on Matt. iii. 6. which being so remarkable, I will transcribe the whole passage: 'For the manner of baptizing,' says he, 'was to plunge or *dip* them into the water, as even the word 'βαπτίζειν itself plainly enough shews; which as it does not signify 'δύνειν, *to sink down and perish*, neither certainly does it signify 'ἐπιπολάζειν, (*to swim or float a-top*); these three words, ἐπιπολάζειν, 'βαπτίζειν, δύνειν, being very different. Hence it appears, that it 'was not without reason that some have long since insisted on the

<sup>a</sup> Ad voc. βαπτίζω, ut quæ tingendi aut abluendi gratia aquæ immergimus.

<sup>b</sup> Ad voc. βαπτίζω. Tertullianus de Corona Militis, magis proprie interpretatus est *mergitare*, servata propter trinam immersionem, forma quam frequentativam grammatici vocant.

<sup>c</sup> Etymologic. in voc. Baptismus. Etsi autem βάπτω et βαπτίζω, tum *mergo*, vel *mergito*, tum *tingo* transferri soleant; proprie tamen *mergo* notant, et μεταληπτικῶς *tingo*.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. Nam posterior est immersione tinctura, quia hæc immersione fit.

‘immersion of the whole body, in baptism, for which they urge the word βαπτίζειν. But their opinion is justly long since exploded, the force and energy of this sacred mystery not consisting in that circumstance.’ A very poor evasion for so great a man, after he had granted so much: he allows baptism was administered by immersion, and that CHRIST, when he commanded to baptize, commanded to *immerse*, or plunge, for that, he says, is the signification of the word: and now, after these concessions, he and all those who make so free with our LORD’s institutions, as to pretend it is not necessary to perform them just as he has directed, should consider how they will be able to answer it, and whether it does not look a little too much like mocking him, when they deviate from what they know to be his command.

Grotius, than whom no man ever knew better, gives it on my side, in his Annotations on the same place, Matt. iii. 6. ‘That this rite was wont to be performed by immersion, and not by perfusion, appears both by the propriety of the word, and the places chosen for its administration, John iii. 23, Acts viii. 38, and by the many allusions of the apostles, which cannot be referred to sprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4, Col. ii. 12. The custom of perfusion or aspersion seems to have obtained some time after, in favour of such who lying dangerously ill were desirous to dedicate themselves to CHRIST: these were called *clinics* by other Christians. See Cyprian’s Epistle to Magnus to this purpose. Nor should we wonder that the old Latin Fathers use *tingere* for *baptizare*, seeing the Latin word *tingo* does properly and generally signify the same as *mersare*, to *immerse* or *plunge*.’

To the same purpose speaks the celebrated Dionysius Petavius, giving instances of the church’s power to alter or impose: ‘And indeed,’ says he, ‘immersion is properly styled βαπτισμός, though at present we content ourselves with pouring water on the head,

<sup>c</sup> Hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus, ut in aquas immergerentur: quod vel ipsa vox βαπτίζειν declarat satis; quæ ut non significat δύνειν, quod est *fundum petere cum sua perniciæ*, ita profecto non est ἐπιτολάζειν, Differunt enim hæc tria ἐπιτολάζειν, βαπτίζειν, δύνειν. Unde intelligimus non esse abs re quod jampridem nonnulli disputarunt de toto corpore immergendo in ceremonia baptismi: vocem enim βαπτίζειν urgebant. Sed horum sententia merito est jampridem explosa, cum non in eo posita sit mysterii hujus vis et ἐνέργεια.

<sup>f</sup> Mersatione autem non perfusione

agi solitum hunc ritum indicat et vocis proprietas, et loca ad eum ritum delecta, Joh. iii. 23; Act. viii. 38; et allusiones multæ apostolorum, quæ ad adpersionem referri non possunt, Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12. Serius aliquanto invaluisse videtur mos perfundendi sive aspergendi, in eorum gratiam qui in gravi morbo cubantes nomen dare CHRISTO expetebant, quos cæteri κλινικὸς vocabant. Vide Epist. Cypriani ad Magnum. Quod autem *tingere* pro *baptizare* usurpant Latini veteres mirum videri non debet, cum Latine *tingendi* vox et proprie et plerumque idem valeat quod *mersare*. Pag. 103.



‘ which in Greek is called *περίχυσις*,’ that is, *perichysm*, if I may so Anglicise, but not *baptism*.

But why do I spend time in transcribing these quotations, when there are such large collections already, which render this labour needless, and will make any modest person blush, to say in general, that critics and learned men allow of that pretended sense of the word? Mr. Stennet, in his answer to Russen, a book Mr. Wall has seen, and I wish he had considered it more impartially, for then I am satisfied he would have laid by his design, and there would have been no occasion for these letters; Mr. Stennet, I say, has furnished us with so many instances, both ancient and modern, of this nature, some of which are taken from the greatest men of the Church of England now living, or lately dead, that he makes the thing evident almost to demonstration; so that I am in no fear of being contradicted by the learned, who acknowledge all I plead for in this case.

And indeed you may be pleased to observe, sir, (though Mr. Wall ventures with such an air of assurance to affirm, ‘ it is plainly a ‘ mistake<sup>h</sup>,’ to say, ‘ that *baptize* means only *dip*, and that it appears ‘ to be so from the Greek writers and critics,’ &c.) that he is certainly under some apprehension on this point, by his passing over this part of the argument so willingly: and, which is something strange, and does not argue abundance of ingenuity, Mr. Wall, you may remember, produces the suffrages of several learned men, and pleads strongly himself for immersion, in the ninth chapter of his second part, where he confesses immersion is the more regular and convenient manner, and most agreeable to the example of CHRIST and the primitive church. But to qualify this concession, he adds indeed, that immersion is not so necessary to baptism, but it may be administered by affusion, &c., which looks to me like a contradiction of what he allowed before; for nothing certainly should be done in this case, but what is most regular and agreeable to the practice of CHRIST and his apostles; nothing should be ordinarily practised now, which is not so well as what was ordinarily practised then.

But to leave this: pray whence did Mr. Wall receive his knowledge that baptism may be administered by pouring, &c.? I have already largely, and, I think, beyond contradiction, proved, that with the Greek authors, and other learned men, the word is never used to signify *pouring*, but always *dipping*. But it seems our

<sup>g</sup> Dogmat. Theologic. lib. ii. de Pœnitentia, cap. i. § 11. Ac sane immersio proprie dicitur βαπτισμός, cum hodie satis

habeamus aquam capiti affundere, quod Græce dicitur περίχυσις.

<sup>h</sup> Part ii. pag. 219. [536, 537.]

author was aware of this, and therefore tells us, ‘What the Greek writers and critics, &c. say, is not much to the purpose; for the sense of a Scripture-word is not to be taken from them, but from the use of it in Scripture<sup>i</sup>;’ from whence he pretends it may be plainly determined to signify *to wash* in general. But, notwithstanding he takes the liberty to assert this, I hope to prove he is in an error, and to fortify my proofs from the constant use of the word among the Greeks, with the authority of the Scripture too; and to shew it was thus only that the apostles and primitive Christians understood the word, and practised this sacred ordinance.

In the Seventy’s translation of the Old Testament, and the Apocrypha too, I can find but twenty-five places where the words occur; and in eighteen of them they do undoubtedly mean *to dip*, as you will allow, if you read over the verses cited below<sup>k</sup>; for I do not think you are likely to make such a trifling remark on any passage, as Mr. Wall has on Levit. xiv. 6. He was endeavouring, if you remember, to shew from the Old Testament, that the word does not necessarily signify *to dip*; and quotes this place of Leviticus, than which nothing could be more directly against him, and observes thus: ‘The word is βάπτει, and the English *dip*, yet it cannot be understood dipping all over; for the blood of the bird in the bason could not be enough to receive the living bird, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet and the hyssop all into it<sup>l</sup>.’ Now supposing this to be true, how does it prove the word does not signify *to dip*? The most he can infer from it, is only that it does not always necessarily mean *to dip all over*; and he should have been so just to his readers, as not to have confounded this with dipping in general; by this stratagem making such as are willing to believe it take this for a good plain objection, and (because it seems, as Mr. Wall represents the matter, not to mean that the living bird, &c., were dipped all over) to infer, the word in this place does not signify *to dip* at all. This, if any thing, must be his meaning here. But if he would not be so understood, it will be no easy thing to imagine what he can suppose the word does here signify. Undoubtedly he cannot mean that the bird, &c., were *poured* or *sprinkled* into the blood, or the like; and yet, if he would not allow the word to signify *to dip*, he ought at least to have told us what is the signification of it, and not have left us wholly in the dark.

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. p. 219, 220. [536, 537.]

<sup>k</sup> Exod. xii. 22; Lev. iv. 6, 17; ix. 9; xi. 32; xiv. 6, 16, 51; Numb. xix. 18; Deut. xxxiii. 24; Josh. iii. 15; Ruth ii. 14; 1 Sam. xiv. 27; and 2 Kings v. 14;

viii. 15; Job ix. 31; Psalm lxviii. 23; Judith xii. 7.

<sup>l</sup> Part ii. p. 221. [The clause here animadverted on had been left out of his second edition by Dr. Wall.]

Farther, to go on still with the supposition that the living bird, &c., could not be *dipped all over*; this does not affect our dispute, since we readily grant there may be such circumstances in some cases, which necessarily and manifestly shew the thing spoken of is not said to be dipped all over; but it does not therefore follow that the word in that place does not signify *to dip*, and I believe Mr. Wall will allow his pen is *dipped* in the ink, though it is not daubed all over, or *totally immersed*. So that after all he says, it still remains that the word does signify *to dip*.

Besides; I cannot see why it should be thought impossible for the living bird and the other things to be *dipped all over*. It is true, there appears some difficulty in it upon Mr. Wall's supposition, but that is grounded on a very gross mistake; for the order of purification in the case of leprosy was this; to take a quantity of water in an earthen bason, out of a fountain or running stream, which in the remotest times was always judged purest and most proper for their purification; over this vessel of fountain-water they killed the bird, so as to have the blood run into the water, and mix with it in the bason; and then the living bird, the hyssop, &c., were *dipped* into this mixture, which might be capable of receiving them all, though the blood alone, as our author says, was not. And since the Seventy translate verses 6 and 51 in the same manner, viz. *over running water*; and Jonathan's Targum too translates both in the same words, viz. *in blood and in water*, it is plain they understood the two Hebrew phrases to express the same thing.

I might confirm this account of the thing by the testimonies of the Jewish doctors, if they were of any authority; but as they are a very trifling sort of interpreters, of no credit, and never to be depended on, I reject them, and argue only from the reason of the thing, and the plain import of the words themselves, compared with ver. 51, where the dipping into the water, as well as into the blood, is mentioned, perhaps, more distinctly; but it is plain to demonstration, from Heb. ix. 19. *For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people.* The utmost, I say, that could be inferred from this passage, is only that the word does not always necessarily imply a *total immersion*, or *dipping* the whole thing spoken of *all over*; which I readily allow: but then, sir, we should remember, it is not from any thing limiting the sense of βαπτίζω, but from something limiting the extent of the action in the subject, which directs us to apply the full sense of the word to one particular thing, or



perhaps to one part of a thing only; for a synecdoche does not affect the verb, but the thing spoken of. Thus, to use the familiar instance I mentioned before, we say, *dip the pen*, meaning only the nib of it, which we really dip into ink; though the whole pen is not *dipped all over*, yet the part particularly referred to is, and the pen may be truly said to be *dipped*; according to that known rule, What is true of any one part, may be said of the whole complexly, though not of every part of the whole separately.

Of the twenty-five instances where the word is used in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, eighteen, you see, sir, are manifestly used to signify *to dip*. There would be no need to mention the other seven that remain, after what has been said, but that Mr. Wall insinuates, and would have it believed, that it may be abundantly proved from Scripture, that the word does not always mean *to dip*. These places which still remain, if there be any difficulty in them, may be easily accounted for by what I have already said on some passages parallel to them; however, I must just mention them.

The Seventy have translated Isaiah xxi. 4. very loosely, and without any occasion use the word in dispute. The sense in the Hebrew runs thus: *My heart has wandered, and horror has affrighted me*: but they have rendered it, *and iniquity* (ἁμαρτία) *overwhelms me*. The sense is obvious to those who are acquainted with the style of the prophets, which abounds with frequent metaphors and allusions. I have accounted for this manner of speech already<sup>m</sup>; and shewn, that taking it for a kind of simile, and supplying what is necessary to fill up the sense, it rather proves than makes any objection against what I plead for. Besides, as the word here cannot be understood to signify *to wash, pour, or sprinkle, &c.*, I suppose nobody will urge this place against me.

The instance in Ezekiel xxiii. 15 is manifestly an argument on my side, if you consider what I said above on those phrases which speak of dying; and it may be noted that ἀπαβαπτίζ here signifies *dipped*, as much as does the Hebrew word טביל, which is translated by it: the original signifying what our English version here calls *dyeed attire*; and every one must own טביל signifies only *to dip*.

I do not know whether you will think Dan. iv. 20, and v. 12, more intricate than the preceding instances: but because Mr. Wall has endeavoured to defend himself by it, I must take a little the more notice of it. The same word is used in both places, and



on the same occasion, and therefore we may consider them as one passage.

The word here used in the original is יִצְטַבֵּעַ, which in the Chaldee necessarily implies *dipping*; witness Buxtorf, Castell, &c., and above all, the constant use of the word. It is by this word the Jerusalem Targum renders the Hebrew טָבַל, Levit. iv. 6, the only place where that imperfect version translates the Hebrew word; but had it been complete, we should probably have had more instances.

In other places where the word is used, though not to translate טָבַל, it is always in the same sense, signifying to *immerse* or *drown*; as Exod. xv. 4, in which place the Jerusalem Targum, Jonathan's Paraphrase, and that called Onkelos, the Syriac version, and the original of Moses, do all use טָבַע or טָמַע to signify *immerse*, *plunge*, or *drown*, as our version renders it: but I suppose it will not be questioned, otherwise I would attempt more largely to prove this word does always properly signify *to dip*. To this consideration, if it be added that the word by which the Seventy turn it into Greek, is also confessed on all hands to have primarily and generally this signification, there can be no difficulty to determine the sense of the word in this place. For since the Greek word commonly and properly signifies *to dip*, and is put for a Chaldee one of undoubtedly the same meaning, it must be very natural to judge that to be the true sense, and what the writers here intended.

It is indeed used here metaphorically, as it is five times in these two chapters on this same occasion; and therefore the Seventy render it once by κοιτάξασθαι, *made to lie*; and twice, according to the vulgar editions, by ἀνλίζεσθαι, *to lie all night*, as verses 23. 25; though some copies, which seem to preserve the ancient true reading, with Theodoret, translate it literally in this last verse by βαφήσεται, *shall be dipped*; as the Seventy also have thought fit to do, verse 33, (the place which Mr. Wall quotes,) and chap. v. 21, retaining the metaphor. Hence it seems very clear, that both Daniel and his translators designed to express the great dew Nebuchadnezzar should be exposed to, more emphatically, by saying, he should lie in dew, and be covered with it all over, as if he had been *dipped*: for that is so much like being dipped, as at most to differ no more than being in, and being put in; so that the metaphor is very easy, and not in the least strained.

The translators abundantly intimate, they thought this to be the true sense of the place, by varying, as they have, the word in their

version, which in the original is but one: they turn it *κοιτάζεσθαι*, and *αλλίζεσθαι*, to express his lying out in the open air; and *βάπτεσθαι*, to signify he should be as wet by it, as if he had been dipped in dew. But having said so much already, I will only add in passing, that the dews in the East are generally very large, as appears from several passages of Scripture, as well as from the accounts of travellers into those parts. Therefore, in the story of Gideon's fleece, you find, after it had been exposed to the open air all night, he pressed out of it a *bowl full of water*, Judges vi. 38. And the holy Psalmist, setting forth the advantages of unity, compares it to *the dew of Hermon, and the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion*, Psalm cxxxiii. 3. And philosophically speaking, the hottest climates and clearest skies naturally abound most with dew, which is also confirmed by constant experience. It is commonly known to be so in her Majesty's leeward-islands in America; where one season of the year, when they have no rains for a considerable time together, the fruits of the earth would be burnt up, were it not for the dews which fall plentifully in the night. That incomparable mathematician, Captain Halley, observed, when making some experiments in St. Helena, that the dews fell in such abundance, as to make his paper too wet to write on, and his glasses unfit for use without frequent wiping. And as to Africa in particular, where part of Nebuchadnezzar's dominions lay, Pliny tells us, the nights there were very dewy. Egypt has little or no rain, but is fed by the overflowing of the Nile, and by constant nocturnal dews: and Nebuchadnezzar kept his court in a country of near the same latitude, and consequently of the like temperament.

It appears from hence, how properly the sacred writer has, on this occasion, used a word so emphatical and expressive, and avoided one that would only have signified a moderate, gentle wetting; for that had fallen short of the truth, and not expressed so fully as was necessary, the great quantity of dew by which he was made very wet. This shews also how faulty those versions are which take a word too weak, and that does not by far reach the full sense.

The authors of the ancient and valuable Syriac version, who were of the neighbourhood of Babylon, and well enough acquainted with the large dews in those parts, and endeavoured to give an exact literal translation, have shunned this error: it is worth our observing, that they render the word there by ܠܒܫ, which from the Hebrew טבַע to *put into any thing*, as 1 Sam. xvii. 49, signifies to *immerse*, or *dip*; but never once, that I know of, to *wash*, or *sprinkle*, or simply to *wet*. And in these verses the same word is always used in the

same sense; which makes it very plain how those interpreters understood it, and that they thought that manner of expression very proper and suitable to the thing intended.

And now from all these considerations I think it is very plain what is the true sense of this place, and that it makes nothing against me. For the interpretation I give is grounded on the certain allowed general sense of the words, is very agreeable to the nature and common use of languages; and withal, exactly conformable to the design of the writer; and strongly countenanced by the original word, and the best translations: and nothing more than all this can be desired to justify any interpretation whatever.

But after all, if notwithstanding what has been said, any can possibly judge this sense of the place which I have given, not so necessary as I pretend, the objection Mr. Wall raises from it is however effectually enervated: for if it is in itself so uncertain and obscure, as to afford no necessary argument for my opinion; he and all men must however grant they can draw no necessary consequence from it against me. For it will be allowed, that the words are at least capable of my exposition, without any absurdity or constraint at all. I have now but one passage or two more to take notice of, from the Old Testament and Apocrypha.

Ecclesiasticus xxxi. 30, but in the English it is ver. 26: *The furnace proveth the edge* (in the tempering, ἐν βαφῇ) *by dipping*. This is just like the first quotation from Homer; and what I have said there may serve to illustrate this, especially if we add Didymus' note on that place, that 'red-hot iron, by being dipped into cold water, becomes very hard<sup>9</sup>.'

The word is used again, 2 Mace. i. 21, to signify *drawing water*, viz. by *dipping* a bucket, &c. And this use of it I have largely considered before, and therefore shall need add but one remark here, that it is necessary the word should signify to *dip* in this place, because the water is said to be at the bottom of a deep pit, ver. 19. Now it is certain the water could not be drawn up, as our translation reads it, without *dipping* the vessel into it: so that the force of the word cannot be expressed more exactly than by our English phrase, to 'dip a pail or bucket of water.'

But of all the texts which can be produced, some think Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25 the most considerable by far; and indeed they may give it a very plausible appearance. The words are in our translation, *He that washeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he*

<sup>9</sup> Τὸ βάψαι ψυχρῷ τὸν πεπυραμένον σίδηρον. ἰσχυρὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ποιεῖ.



*touch it again, what availeth his washing?* Βαπτίζόμενος is the word; and it is here used to signify that washing which the law enjoined upon all who had been defiled by touching a dead body. Now the manner of purification in such cases is thus described, Numb. xix. 18, *And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it* (by the way, you may observe, the word here is βάψει, and plainly signifies *to dip*, though perhaps it was not *dipped all over*, no more than our author thinks the living bird, &c. were, in an instance we considered before) *in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, &c., and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave.* There are other passages to the same purpose, which either mention this sprinkling, or plainly enough allude to it, as ver. 9. *And it* (viz. the holy water) *shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel, for a water of separation.*

These and such like other places, which make sprinkling necessary, may seem to put the matter beyond dispute; and I remember the time, when I thought this a very formidable instance; but I soon found and corrected my mistake: and I think it is exceeding clear, to any who are willing to see it, that a farther washing is necessary besides these sprinklings, and that this washing was the finishing of the ceremony. The defiled person was to be sprinkled with the holy water on the third and on the seventh day, only as preparatory to the great purification which was to be by washing the body and clothes on the seventh day, with which the uncleanness ended. Thus Numb. xix. 19 it is said expressly, *And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day: and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even.*

That the word here used in the Hebrew is רָחַץ, can be no objection; for besides that it is said, Levit. xv. 16, (though not in the same particular case,) *Then he shall wash all his flesh in water,* the word always includes *dipping*, and never signifies less. Thus it is used in the story of Naaman, 2 Kings v. more than once; and is explained at last, by Naaman's action related verse 14, and by the word טָבַל, which it is expressed by in the Hebrew, and which the Seventy have rendered there by βαπτίζεν: and all this evidently shews, that Naaman, the historian, and these translators, understood it to mean *to wash by dipping*.

Some, indeed, are pleased to fancy the words which command bathing, are not spoken of the unclean person who had touched the dead, but of the priest officiating; and they fortify this surmise by the seventh and eighth verses preceding, where the priest is expressly



commanded to wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water. But it does not follow, because this place relates to the priest, that the other does so too; nay rather, it is absurd it should, for it interrupts and confounds the sense of the place; besides, in the very next verse but one, viz. 21, it is ordered, *that he who sprinkleth the water of separation shall wash his clothes, &c.*, plainly intimating that was not the design of the words almost immediately foregoing. Besides, it cannot be reasonably imagined, that the priest by barely purifying the unclean, should need so much greater a washing and purification than the unclean himself.

This also, I think, will further appear, by comparing this place with Levit. xi. 31, 32, which speaks of the same thing, viz. of pollution contracted by touching that which is dead; and says, the thing so polluted *must be put into water*. And here it may be noted again by the way, that the Seventy have chosen βαφήσεται, as the most proper word to comprehend the full sense of the Hebrew phrase במים יובא, than which (the verb being in the form they call *hophal*) no words can more strictly and emphatically signify, *it shall be put into water*; and therefore it is very surprising to find that Dr. Pococke could possibly suffer himself, on another occasion, to translate these words שיביא ידיו במים, *manus aqua perfuderit*<sup>r</sup>, directly contrary to the true obvious sense. I will not pretend to guess what could move him to this, but I confess this rendering serves his turn best. This is not wholly foreign to the business in hand, though it may be misplaced, and therefore I have just hinted it. But to return.

These two passages, I say, compared together, must be of considerable force, since it is plain from them, that all vessels (except earthen, which were to be broken, Levit. xi. 33.) that had been polluted by the touch of a dead body, were not only to be sprinkled, as Numb. xix. 18, but they were also to be *put into the water*, Levit. xi. 32.

Now since it cannot be thought the person touching the dead was less defiled than the vessels which touched the same, or were only in the tent with it, or that he wanted a less degree of purification; it is very natural, and I think necessary, to understand Numb. xix. 19, to be spoken of the unclean; who, I infer, therefore, was not only to be sprinkled on the third and seventh days, but was also to bathe, dip, and wash himself in water, as is plain too from Numb. xxxi. 21, &c. And if Dr. Pococke's way of arguing from the Mahometans in such cases as this be good, the thing perhaps

<sup>r</sup> Not. Miscellan. cap. 9. pag. 388.

may be yet set in a stronger light: for it is beyond question, that they purify persons defiled by the dead, by immersion and washing all over; as I might shew from the Alcoran, if it were at hand, and several other writers. But instead of all, let this suffice, from the judicious Compendium of the Mahometan Religion, first published from the manuscript by the ingenious Mr. Reland of Utrecht: the author, speaking of that kind of purification by water which they called *Gasl*, in which, he says, the water must touch ‘every hair of the body, and the whole skin all over;’ tells us, ‘this manner of washing the whole body is necessary in order to purification after ‘circumcision, &c., and in case of pollution by the dead’s.’

And this, Strabo informs us<sup>t</sup>, was in use among the Babylonians; whether the Jews borrowed it from them, or they from the Jews. And indeed, to the Jews this was the chief part of the purification, and may alone be called simply the purification; as the seventh day is called the day of purification, or cleansing, Numb. vi. 9, because the purification was completed on that day; or principally, because then this washing or bathing, which was the great as well as the concluding part of the purification, was performed; from which, as the principal part, that day takes its denomination. And by this, which was the chief part, is the whole ceremony intended, Levit. xxii. 6, where it is said of the priests, particularly of Aaron and his sons, they shall not eat of the holy things, after contracting any uncleanness, *unless they wash their flesh in water*, i. e. purify themselves regularly according to the law. In which case, the chief thing to be done was to wash their flesh in water. And Levit. xi. 32, speaking of putting the vessels into water, it is said, *so they shall be cleansed*.

It is the same in other cases: as for instance, in that of leprosy, many things were required for several days, but the chief and most effectual on the eighth, which is therefore called *the day of cleansing*; and the offerings are ordered to be brought *for his cleansing*, Levit. xiv. 23, as if the whole, or at least the main efficacy were ascribed to them.

These considerations necessarily oblige us to believe bathing and washing the whole body in water was not only a necessary, but likewise a chief part of the purification. And after all this, certainly there can remain no difficulty in Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 26. For hence it is very plain, Syracides by βαπτίζόμενος in that place means *bathed, dipped, and washed*; for you see the law required no less, and no less was practised by the Jews, in case of such pollution by the

<sup>s</sup> Page 54. l. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Lib. xvi. p. 1081.

dead. And it is easy to see the reason why he mentions, and more immediately refers to the bathing only; viz. because, as I before noted, that was the chief part, upon which cleanness immediately followed, all the rest being only necessary preparations.

And so we may find in many instances, Lev. xv. and elsewhere, the washing only is expressed, though the holy water was likewise to be sprinkled; for it was kept for a water of separation, and a purification for sin, Numb. xix. 9, and viii. 7. And so the washing only is mentioned in this very case of pollution by a dead body, Levit. xxii. 6, as before noted. And Eleazar, Numb. xxxi. 23, orders *all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make go through the water*; not adding, the water of separation was to be sprinkled on those things: though he there intimates it must be sprinkled on the things which were to pass through the fire; and we are assured, from Numbers xix. 18, it was likewise to be sprinkled on the vessels of wood, &c., which could not bear the fire, but were to be washed, or put into the water, Levit. xi. 32. But besides, it is usual, in speaking of the whole, to mention a part only; which may very well be thought the case in hand, seeing it is proved that dipping was to be one part of the ceremony; and it is allowed by all, that the word does almost constantly, and I think always, signify *to dip, plunge, or put into*. Which considerations render the synecdoche very easy; for thus the word may be used to signify such a washing as includes *dipping*, notwithstanding sprinkling be also one part of the purification: but then it does not so much express the sprinkling as the dipping, on account of which particularly the word is applied to this purification.

Thus I have now revised all that can be urged from the Old Testament, at least all that my own observations and Kircher's industry have furnished me with; and, notwithstanding Mr. Wall's needless appeal to Scripture, have discovered many undoubted instances there of the sense of the word, as used in direct opposition to what Mr. Wall asserts: while no one passage can be found to be on his side; at best, he can urge but two or three, which are very doubtful and obscure; and after all improvements on them, conclude nothing. For whatever real or imaginary difficulties may appear in them, you see, sir, I have fairly removed and accounted for them all.

Let us now, if you please, turn over the New Testament; and see what mighty proofs that affords in our adversaries' favour.

In these most venerable records, which are the unerring rule of our holy religion, the word βαπτίζω is often used, but most commonly concerning the baptism of John, or the Christian sacrament,

which is the subject of our dispute: but it is often without any circumstance which may determine how we must understand it: which, if it proves any thing at all, shews the word is used in the common sense only, and according to the general acceptance; for else it had been necessary to have apprised us of the new and particular unusual sense; and nothing of this being done, it seems reasonable to give it the same signification in all those places as it has every where else. I think this is plain and undeniable; but Mr. Wall believes he can prove, by other instances, that it does not every where else signify *to dip*.

To that purpose he mentions only four, which he calls ‘plain instances;’ and to remove all imaginable difficulties, I will omit none he might possibly have added, except such as are plainly metaphorical, which therefore no man can justly argue from, and they may all be very easily accounted for by what I have said above.

The first, and which he enlarges most upon, is St. Luke xi. 38, which our English reads thus: *And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner.* The original word, he notes, is ἐβαπτίσθη; and comparing this place with St. Mark vii. 5, which speaks particularly of *washing of hands*, he infers, ‘this is a plain instance, that they used the word *to baptize* for any ordinary washing, whether there were dipping in the case or not.’

To make this conclusion pass more securely, he had insinuated before, that ‘their way of that washing was this: they had servants to pour the water on their hands, 2 Kings iii. 11; *who poured water on the hands of Elijah*, i. e. who waited on him as a servant<sup>u</sup>.’

He says no more to prove this custom, but thus slightly overpasses a point which deserved and unavoidably required greater examination, considering the whole stress of his argument depends entirely upon it; for if they washed their hands, as we usually do now, by dipping them into the water, nobody need be told his instance turns against him, and makes considerably for us.

To shew then how little service this does him, give me leave to remark these things to you: in the first place, there is a vast distance of time between the period referred to in the Book of Kings and our Saviour’s time; and the words he cites, at most do but discover what was the custom near a thousand years before, and signify nothing to the time when the words, which are the ground of his inference, were spoken.

And who does not know what great alterations might happen, or

<sup>u</sup> Part ii. p. 220. [537.]



rather must have happened, in such a succession of years? The great revolutions in the states and kingdoms of the world sufficiently shew the power of time; a multitude of examples of this kind may be found in all, and even in our own nation. But not to mention any of those customs, which once universally prevailed among the ancient Britons, and are now quite worn out, I will instance in baptism itself, which all men know was used to be administered in England by dipping, till queen Elizabeth's time: since which, that pure primitive manner is grown into a total disuse, within little more than one hundred years; and *sprinkling*, the most opposite to it imaginable, introduced in its stead. The matter of fact is notorious, or otherwise, I think, it might seem much more incredible, than to suppose a people who once washed their hands by having water poured on them, could possibly one thousand years afterwards, instead of this, wash them as we do now, by dipping them into the water: especially, considering how often they had been conquered, led into captivity and dispersed, and were even then actually under the Roman yoke; for such revolutions always bring great changes in the customs and humours of a people along with them: and the Jews had actually so changed their language in Nehemiah's days, that they did not understand the Scriptures in the Hebrew tongue. Add to this, that Christ himself has assured us, they were an obstinate, bigoted race of men, *a stiff-necked generation*, as their prophets styled them; and though they valued themselves extremely on their law, yet our Saviour assures us likewise, that they had introduced abundance of innovations in their religion, so far as to destroy its essence, and vacate the grand points of that very law they were so proud of; and that particularly in the washings it prescribed: and yet this is certainly much harder to conceive them capable of doing, than that they should make an alteration in the manner of washing their hands. But secondly,

I observe the words do not prove what Mr. Wall cites them for: as our translation reads them, they appear, indeed, to countenance his supposition, that about Elijah's time they might perhaps wash their hands after that manner; but if you read the original, sir, you will allow the place might be altogether as well rendered, *who poured out water for*, not upon, *the hands of Elijah*; the Hebrew particle על often signifying *for*, in this sense, as Psalm xxxii. 6, על זאת, *for this cause shall every one that is godly pray unto thee*, &c. And thus it is used very frequently, as in all those numerous instances where it is joined with כן; so for example, Gen. ii. 24, על—כן, ἐνεκεν τούτου, according to the Seventy: and perhaps our Lord from them,

Matt. xix. 5, *For this cause*, say our translators, *shall a man leave father and mother, &c.* So again, Gen. xi. 9, עֵל—בָּן, διὰ τοῦτο; for this cause, or, *therefore is the name of it called Babel.* And once more for all, Prov. xxviii. 21, עֵל—פֶּת—לֶחֶם, in our translation, *for a piece of bread that man will transgress.*

It is plain from these instances, without adding any more, that the words naturally admit a different sense from what Mr. Wall would fix on them, and therefore can avail him nothing. But,

Lastly, if it is worth while to inquire what was the custom so long ago, in a matter of this nature, it will with little search appear at least very probable, that their religious washing of their hands and feet was performed by dipping them into the water. For when Moses received directions from God concerning the utensils of the tabernacle, he was commanded, among other things, to make a laver of brass, in which water was to be kept between the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, for the priests to wash their hands and feet before they entered the tabernacle, or when they approached the altar to offer; *so they shall wash their hands and their feet, that they die not*, Exod. xxx. 21. The word here used by the sacred penman in the original is רָחַץ; which, as I before noted, generally, and I think always, includes *dipping* in its signification; and therefore too makes it at least probable they were to wash their hands and feet by dipping them into the water. Had יָצַק been used here, as in 2 Kings iii. 11, above cited, which signifies *to pour*, Mr. Wall would scarce have omitted this passage, but have thought it very convincing and strong on his side; as now, I think, it must be allowed to be against him.

The same word, we may observe, is used 2 Chron. iv. 6, about the vast brasen sea Solomon caused to be made, which held two hundred baths, that is, near one thousand barrels of water: the bulk of it argues the priests were to go into it; the words express it also, *the sea was for the priests to wash in*, בָּרַךְ. So again, in another instance, Exod. xxix. 4, concerning the consecration of the priests, which Jonathan renders טָבַל, *thou shalt dip them in forty measures of spring water.*

Farther: that this was the way our Lord took when he washed his disciples' feet, John xiii. 5, seems very certain, both from the propriety of the words, and the manner in which it is related: *After that, he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, &c.* We see the water was not poured on their feet, but into the bason, before he came to them, where their feet were to be washed. The book that goes under the name of the Apostolical

Constitutions relates the action thus : ‘ After that, he poured water ‘ into a bason, and as we sat, he came to us, and washed our feet, ‘ and wiped them with a towel<sup>x</sup>.’ The bason here is *νιπήρ*, which signifies a vessel to wash in; from whence it has its name, as the water they washed with was also from thence called *νίμμα*, *νίπτρον*, *ποδόνιπτρον*, or *χειρόνιπτρον*, and the like; and so Eustathius<sup>y</sup> upon Homer explains *χέρνιβα* to mean ‘ the water which is poured out ‘ for,’ not upon, ‘ the hands;’ by which their custom, as well as the sense of the words, is expressed. And to all this we may add, that Mark vii. 3, *unless they wash πνυγῆ*, (up to the elbow or wrist,) must imply *dipping*. But, besides what our author had said himself to support his opinion, he refers us also, in his margin, to Dr. Pococke; who, he says, ‘ has largely proved in his *Note Miscell.* from Maimonides and others, that this was the Jews’ way;’ and then, not very fairly, adds a piece of a sentence, which would make any one think the doctor meant that the Jews never washed but by affusion, which seems not a fair way of dealing with the authority he cites in his defence; or does he think none have read the doctor’s writings but himself?

That learned gentleman, I know, has taken a world of labour to explain several particulars relating to the washing of hands, according to the sentiments of the Jewish doctors; and has shewn himself very well versed in the rabbinical writings, which he understood, perhaps, as well as ever Maimonides did. But really, sir, I should have honoured his parts and learning much more, if he had trusted less to those fanciful authors the rabbins, whose commentaries are frivolous and impertinent; and, in short, it is impossible to erect a firm building on so uncertain a foundation. As for Maimonides, whose authority, Mr. Wall is careful to inform us, is used by Dr. Pococke in this affair, perhaps, to intimate that the matter is therefore grounded on unexceptionable evidence; I confess, he was one of the greatest and most judicious that ever appeared among the rabbins, but a true rabbin notwithstanding, and perfectly besotted to the idle dreams in which their boasted knowledge chiefly consists; and consequently, even he cannot be much depended on: besides, he lived not above six hundred years ago, that is about one thousand one hundred after Christ<sup>z</sup>, and therefore could know what was practised in our Saviour’s time no better than many can now; and yet he is by far the best authority of any Dr. Pococke makes use of.

<sup>x</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 19. Εἴτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπήρα καὶ ἡμῶν ἀνακειμένων ἐπελθὼν, πάντων ἡμῶν ἔνιψε τοὺς πόδας, καὶ τῷ λεντίῳ ἐξέμαξε.

<sup>y</sup> Pag. 1401. Χέρνιβα δὲ τὰ εἰς χεῖρὸς νίμμα καταχέμενα.

<sup>z</sup> R. David Ganz.

I would not be thought to slight the testimony of the rabbins thus, because they are against me in this point, or that I am so hampered with what the doctor says, that I can answer no other way but by lessening their credit; for neither they nor the doctor are so much against me as Mr. Wall pretends: besides, they have not this character from me alone, but from all who are acquainted with them, even those persons that follow and depend on them so much, which is something strange. But I shall have occasion to say more of them in another place, where I may give some reasons for my opinion.

But because our author refers, not so much to the rabbins themselves as to Dr. Pococke, a man of very great reputation, especially for his skill in these things; in deference to him I will take notice of a line or two in the chapter Mr. Wall has cited; which may discover how much he abuses the doctor, who very fully grants all I need desire: for he allows βαπτίζεσθαι signifies more than χερνίπτειν, *to wash the hands*; so that βαπτίζεσθαι must signify more than barely any manner of washing them, and he can mean no less than to *dip* them: for his words are; ‘These things abundantly confirm what I asserted in the beginning, viz. that טבל (which answers to βαπτίζεσθαι in the Greek) signifies a farther degree of purification than נטל, or χερνίπτειν, yet not so as necessarily to imply an immersion of the whole body; for the greatest and most notorious uncleanness of the hands reached but to the *perek*, or the wrist, and was cleansed by immersing or dipping them up so high<sup>a</sup>.’

How different is this from our author’s representation of the doctor’s opinion, that the ‘Jews do not wash their hands, but by having water poured on them!’ Whereas, you see, the doctor says, he has been abundantly proving, that טבל or βαπτίζεσθαι does signify more than simply to wash the hands; and the following lines, wherein he explains what he means by more than χερνίπτειν, shew clearly that he means to *immerse* or *dip*, as appears by the instance, and the express words he makes use of: and therefore also assigning the reason why βαπτίζεσθαι is used, Mark vii. 4, he recurs to this custom of dipping their hands into the water, from which alone, he thinks, the expression is to be justified; intimating, or rather asserting, that the word is used there, and in the parallel

<sup>a</sup> Not. Miscell. cap. 9. pag. 393. In his quæ produximus est quod ea quæ initio diximus abunde confirmet, esse scil. טבל (quod βαπτίζεσθαι significat) ulteriorem purgationis gradum quam is qui per נטל seu χερνίπτειν intelligitur, nec tamen

totius corporis mersionem necessariò indigitare, cum vel gravissima ac manifesta manuum immundities τῇ *perek*, seu ea quæ ad brachiale est junctura finiatur, ac manuum eousque mersione tollatur, &c.



places, with a particular regard to that practice. So Dr. Hammond understands him, and determines this to be the sense of the place too; for he says, the word signifies the 'washing of any part, as the hands here, by way of immersion in water, as that is opposed to 'affusion or pouring water on them<sup>b</sup>.' But Dr. Pococke's words are these:

'I will give you my opinion: for their common ordinary meals, they were at liberty, either to immerse or dip their hands in a spring, or a bason which held a certain quantity of water, or to wash them in the manner I described, by pouring water on them. Since then they might wash which of these ways they pleased, and it is likely enough some who pretended to a more than ordinary sanctity, &c.—might choose that which was reckoned the chief; it is not without great reason, that a word is used which should comprehend both ways: for though βαπτίζεσθαι does indeed principally agree to the immersion, yet that it does not necessarily and only signify that, I think is plain from Luke xi. 38<sup>c</sup>.' I add these last words, because in them the doctor seems to declare against me, by instancing in the place under consideration, to prove that βαπτίζω does not always mean *to dip*. But,

First, it is no good argument, but downright begging the question, to instance in the very case disputed. And secondly, the doctor having just before allowed that the Jews did wash by dipping as well as by affusion, and that the word does properly and principally signify such a washing as is performed by dipping, and withal accounting from these considerations for the use of it in Mark vii. 4. which is parallel to this in Luke xi. 38,—it appears not only reasonable but necessary to understand the doctor's meaning to be, that the word does not *necessarily and only* signify *to dip*; for so his sense is consistent with what he had said before, and is indeed all he intended to prove by it; though at the same time, I must say again, even this is but begging the question.

Thus much then may be fairly gathered from the doctor's words; that in Luke xi. 38. and Mark vii. 4. βαπτίζεσθαι does naturally *and principally* signify to wash the hands by dipping; which is all I

<sup>b</sup> Annot. on Mark vii. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Not. Miscell. cap. 9. p. 397. Dicam quod sentio; cibum ordinarium capturis liberum erat sive manus in aquarum justæ mensuræ conceptaculum, vel fontem immergere, sive easdem eo quem descripsimus modo, aqua affusa lavare:—Cum ergo utram mallent harum lotionum adhibere possent, et satis probabile sit ex iis

qui majorem sanctimonie speciem præ se ferrent, fuisse qui—eam quæ gravissima putabatur observarent, non sine magna ratione usurpatum videatur verbum quod utramque comprehenderet. Nam quamvis βαπτίζεσθαι ei revera, quæ immersione fit, præcipue competat, non tamen de ea solum, vel necessario dici patere arbitror ex illo quod occurrit Luc. xi. 38.

desire, and directly contrary to what Mr. Wall cites him for. He supposes, indeed, that it is used to comprehend the other way of washing too; but this is an arbitrary supposition, which seems to be made only to serve a turn: nor does he so much as go about to prove the word is ever once used so; the only reason he has to think it, are the sayings of the rabbins. But I wonder a man of the doctor's parts should (contrary to what he granted was the proper and general, and I add the constant use of the word) wrest and strain the sacred text, to make it comply with the senseless fancies of those chimerical men.

In fine; what the doctor says from the rabbins, we see, is of no great weight; and if it were ever so considerable, yet it makes nothing for Mr. Wall, but rather against him. For since it is beyond dispute, that the word properly and generally signifies *to dip*; and that the Jews did, at least sometimes, wash by dipping; and that dipping also was thought a more perfect purification, which therefore, at least, some of the superstitious Pharisees very strictly adhered to: it is very natural, and even necessary, to believe the word means nothing less in the place before us; especially if it be considered, it is a zealous Pharisee who is there speaking, who also, perhaps, looked for signs of the severest sanctity in a person who set up for a censor and reformer even of the sect of the Pharisees themselves; who made such mighty pretences to, and had gained so great a reputation for holiness, &c. Add to all this, that if any heed is to be given to the words themselves, the plain letter of the holy text, which implies *to dip*, is on my side; while on the contrary, Mr. Wall produces no one thing to make it probable, in the least degree, that the Pharisee, or if you please St. Luke, did not mean *to dip*.

But I have run too great a length on this passage; and will therefore endeavour to contract on those which remain.

The next instance Mr. Wall makes use of is Mark vii. 4, which he brings as an undoubted proof for his purpose: and, as if it needed or was capable of no improvement, he only remarks, that 'what is translated *the washing of pots*, &c. is in the original *the baptizing of pots*, &c. And what is there said, when they come from market, 'except they wash they eat not; the words of St. Mark are, *except they be baptized, they eat not*<sup>d</sup>. Profound observations! any man of a different disposition from Mr. Wall would have taken this for a very clear instance against him; or to be sure no other man could have cited these words, but he would at least have thought it neces-

<sup>d</sup> [Part ii. p. 220, of the first edition; part ii. p. 537, of the present.]

sary to say something however, to shew which way they so strangely and wonderfully prove βαπτίζω does not signify *to dip*. I cannot but wonder what it is Mr. Wall means; for, as to the vessels, if we know any thing of the matter, they were to be cleansed by putting them into the water, at least if we may take the express word of God for it, Lev. xi. 32. And Dr. Hammond says, 'The baptism of cups is putting into water all over, rinsing them.' And as to the persons, whether they washed by *dipping*, and whether they washed all over, or some part only, deserved to have been a little more enlarged on: but why do I say a little more, when he has said nothing at all to it, but has taken it for granted, without the least hesitation? as if it was a self-evident first principle, that it is very direct and strong in his favour, notwithstanding he has allowed that the Jews did immerse the thing or person to be washed<sup>f</sup>.

And here again our author refers you to his margin, to one line or not so much, which he has transcribed from Dr. Pococke, in these words; 'They who washed at coming from the market did not dip 'their whole bodies<sup>g</sup>;' which words Mr. Wall brings in with a very magisterial air in these terms, 'This was not dipping.' But, by his and the doctor's leave, it is a mistake: for they, when they came from market, did wash by dipping; and these dogmatical assertions will not be thought to go a great way to prove the contrary.

The doctor, indeed, sets himself with all his might to justify his opinion; and to that end calls in the whole body of rabbins to his assistance, such as it is, light and inconsiderable enough in reason; but never attempts, as I remember, to give one instance that the word is so used as he pretends: which, nevertheless, would have carried something more of solidity in it, than thus to build all on the authority of a thousand rabbins, who make reason and revelation the least part of the rule they speak by; and yet these men only does the doctor oppose to the universal acceptance of the word, and the venerable authority of the sacred text. What respect can such persons have to that awful *pillar and ground of the truth*, who industriously make it bend and yield to the silly whimsies of these men? But against them and the doctor I produce Vatablus, a man so singularly versed in the rabbinical writings, that even the Jews themselves, as Monsieur de Thou tells us, greatly admired his lectures, and attended them when he was public Hebrew professor at Paris. Vatablus says, 'They washed themselves all over<sup>h</sup>.' And

<sup>c</sup> Annot. in Mark vii. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. page 324. [This expression, with the entire clause which contained it, had been left out by Dr. Wall from his

second edition.]

<sup>g</sup> Lavantes a foro totum corpus non mersabant. Notæ Misc. cap. 9.

<sup>h</sup> Ad Marc. vii. 4. Se totos abluebant.

to pass by others, I will only add the authority of the admirable Grotius, who ought never to be named without a mark of honour; he says on Mark vii. 4: 'They were more solicitous to cleanse themselves from the defilement they had contracted in the market; and therefore they not only washed their hands, but immersed their whole body<sup>i</sup>.'

These authorities are vastly beyond Mr. Wall's quotation, and proportionably determine the thing against him: but as considerable as they are, I do not desire you should trust to these alone neither; for it will likewise appear that antiquity, and, above all, the sacred text itself, contradicts him also.

That it was customary to purify themselves by washing the whole body, at least in some cases, is shewn before; and the priests were particularly forbid to eat, unless they first washed their flesh in water, Lev. xxii. 6. And we have frequent mention among the ancients of the *hemerobaptistæ*, who were so called from their practice of washing themselves in this manner every day; as in the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>k</sup>, where it is noted, that unless they are so washed, *they eat not*; for without washing they thought they could not be saved, according to that renunciation, transcribed by Cotelierius<sup>l</sup> from the *Regius Codex*, 1818. They are inserted in the catalogue of Jewish sects by Hegesippus<sup>m</sup>; and Justin Martyr, mentioning several sects also of the Jews, names these among the rest, and calls them *baptistæ*<sup>n</sup>, from this signification of the word: and these washings are what in the Constitutions<sup>o</sup> are intended by *βαπτισμάτων καθημερινῶν daily washings*, as may be further confirmed by that account given us of one sect of the Jews by Josephus<sup>p</sup>, who lived in the apostolical times, and is of infinitely more credit, and more to be relied on, than all the rabbins; he expressly mentions, more than once, their washing of their bodies. Tertullian too plainly intimates, the Jews used to wash their whole bodies, when he says, 'Though the Jews daily wash every part of their body, yet they are never clean.' And Rabbi Benjamin, in his Itinerary<sup>q</sup>, mentions the Chuthites or Samaritans about Naplosa, formerly Sichem, between Gerizim and Ebal; and says, they still wash their bodies every day.

And what else but this washing of the whole body can be the

<sup>i</sup> Majori cura se purgabant a fori contactu, quippe non manus tantum lavando, sed et corpus mersando.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. vi. cap. 6. Οἱ τινες καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Ad Recognit. lin. i. pag. 499.

<sup>m</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 22. fol. 41.

<sup>n</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. pag. 307. [sect. 80. pag. 178. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>o</sup> Lib. vi. cap. 18.

<sup>p</sup> Bell. Judaic. lib. ii. cap. 7.

<sup>q</sup> Page 19.



meaning of the sacred text; when it is so plain, and beyond all possible ambiguity, that the washing of the hands is mentioned in the words immediately preceding, and therefore cannot without great absurdity be again so formally repeated here? If indeed the words in the third verse expressed only a light washing of the hands, it might then be feasible enough to suppose, that in the fourth, St. Mark designed to signify their extraordinary care to wash them more thoroughly after they had been in the market. But it is not so; for the third verse, it is generally agreed, expresses the greatest and most solemn washing of the hands, whether *πυγμῇ* signifies only *to the wrist*, as Dr. Pococke, Hammond, Whitby, &c. among our own countrymen, think from the rabbins; or (which seems most agreeable to the use of the word) *to the elbow*, as Theophylact is commonly noted to explain it, and some of the best critics, as Drusius, Cappel, &c.

Can any one possibly imagine now, that just after saying *the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands, πυγμῇ (up to the wrist, or elbow,) eat not, holding the tradition of the elders*; the holy evangelist should immediately add, not only that they *always* wash their hands before they eat, but also *when they come from the market, unless they wash their hands, they eat not*? This seems very mean and unnecessary, for it was fully comprehended in the words immediately foregoing, and does not heighten or explain them at all. But to return to the case in hand; if we understand it to mean the washing of the whole body, the sense is pertinent, easy, and natural, and very regularly expressed too; for it is methodical enough to express their common purification first, and then to add, that in case of greater pollution contracted at the market, they were not content with barely this washing, or any thing short of washing the whole body. Albertus Bobovius, chief interpreter to the emperor Mahomet IV, has followed this order in a like case<sup>r</sup>, viz. in describing

<sup>r</sup> [See 'A. Bobovii Tractatus de Turcarum Liturgia, &c. cum Notis Thomæ Hyde, 4<sup>o</sup>. Oxon. 1690.' page 1. The author, Albert Bobowski, was by birth a Pole: being taken prisoner by the Tartars he was sold by them to the Turks, among whom he remained for twenty years; adopted their religion, changed his name, and having at length obtained his freedom, he cultivated both European and Asiatic languages with so much success, that he was promoted to the post of chief interpreter to the emperor.

He studied and wrote much; composed a Turkish Lexicon and Grammar: trans-

lated the Catechism of the Church of England into Turkish, and made a version of the entire Scripture into the same language, the manuscript of which was (and perhaps is still) preserved in the university of Leyden.

His earnest wish was, to renounce the errors of Islamism, and to finish his days in England, in the bosom of our Church, amongst whose members he had many friends. But death overtook him before these desires of his heart could be accomplished. He died at Constantinople in 1675. The learned Dr. Hyde speaks of him with much affection and regret, in

the Mahometan washings, which they borrowed from the Jews: first, he relates their ordinary lustrations, &c., the washing of the face, the hands, and feet, &c., before prayers; and afterwards adds, that upon greater and extraordinary pollutions, they are obliged to wash the whole body. And here by the way, if Dr. Pococke's method were good, we might improve this to our purpose, and shew, that in extraordinary defilements, such as this in St. Mark, the Jews did wash the whole body; for thus the doctor frequently expounds the Jewish ceremonies, by recurring to the Mahometan. But I think we do not need such evidence.

But before I conclude what I have to say on this, give me leave to observe to you, that all the versions in the Polyglot, except Montanus' and the vulgar Latin, to wit, the Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Persic, unanimously understand the words in a sense quite different from what has been hitherto mentioned; that is, they all take the meaning to be, not that the Jews washed themselves, or their hands, &c., when they came from the market; but that the herbs for instance, and other things they bought there, were first to be washed before they could be eaten. Thus they translate the place, 'and what they buy in the market, unless it be washed, they eat not.'

It must be owned, the Greek is capable of this sense; and I wonder commentators have taken so little notice of it, especially since these four valuable versions so entirely agree in it; for the Syriac and Ethiopic are allowed to have been made in or near the apostolic times, and unquestionless by such as understood the Jewish ceremonies very well, and perhaps were Jews themselves, as the greatest part of the Christian church at that time was. I cannot but pay very great respect to such ancient translations, and therefore am willing to grant, this perhaps may be the true meaning.

Robert Stephens, in an ancient manuscript from Italy, and the copy Beza presented to the university of Cambridge, read *ὅταν ἔλθωσιν*, 'when they come;' and therefore our English translators have not put these words in the supplemental character; but Grotius thinks they were conjecturally added in the Greek, by somebody who thought they were wanting; and Lucas Brugensis says, they are inserted from some faulty Latin copies; the most and the best copies omit them, and learned men in general see no necessity of inserting them. But the authority of these ancient versions is, I

the preface to his curious and valuable tract, from which, on account of its considerable rarity, I have thought it worth

while to extract the foregoing particulars.]

had like to have said, irresistible, and shews that undoubtedly they were not in the Autographa, and the earliest copies.

In short, if the sense of the words is as these versions take it, they are directly against Mr. Wall, for nobody will make a question how herbs are washed: and if this is not the sense, yet I think I have shewn plainly enough, that the Jews did sometimes, and more than probably in the present case, wash the whole body: or if after all neither of these senses will be allowed, supposing the place does speak of washing the hands, even Dr. Pococke, Dr. Hammond, &c., allow, and urge it too, that it means to wash them by dipping, which answers my end full as well as either of the other ways; for if the word does but signify *to dip*, I ask no more; let it relate to the whole body, or a part of it only, either way I gain my point.

The next place our author cites will do him as little service as any of those we have already examined are found to do; it is in Heb. ix. 10, *Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances, &c.* Now of these *divers washings*, (βαπτισμοίς,) some, our author tells us, were by bathing, and others by sprinkling; and so takes it for granted that the word in this place signifies to wash in general, and any or all kinds of washing, and to sprinkle as well as to dip.

But you may be pleased to observe, sir, this is grossly begging the question; for without any necessity, meeting with the word here, he supposes all the legal sprinklings are intended by it, as well as the bathings, and so learnedly demonstrates the thing; and then draws his conclusion, that it signifies *to sprinkle*.

But the words, for aught he knows to the contrary, may speak of those washings only which were by bathing or dipping into water; and so Grotius and Dr. Whitby understand them. And therefore supposing the word principally to express *dipping*, and not always or necessarily (if at all) to imply any thing else, which cannot be denied me; and there being nothing in this passage which makes it needful it should include *sprinkling*, it must seem very reasonable to suppose it means only the bathings: for there is not only no mention of sprinkling, &c., or allusion to it; but the word being allowed generally and most properly to signify *to dip*, and here being no intimation that any thing else is intended, it is something of an argument to prove *sprinkling* is not intended.

While our author endeavours to shew this Greek word does sometimes signify to *sprinkle* or *wash*, he should certainly have made use of such instances wherein sprinkling is plainly meant; which, nevertheless, we see, sir, he has not done.

Our translators have rendered the place before us well enough, one would have thought, so as to have given our author no reasonable ground of citing it to the purpose he does. But it seems there is no being safe from the cavils of some men, and therefore I think it might have been rendered something more determinately, *divers bathings* or *dippings*. If it had been so rendered, I presume Mr. Wall would not have thought our translation did at all favour his pretence; and yet the Greek is as expressly against him as that could have been; for I still assert, the word does always, and here too, only signify *dippings*, *bathings*, &c., and unless he can assign a reason to the contrary, the allowed common settled sense of the word will be thought sufficient to justify my assertion. And if it were nothing else, the bare possibility of this being the true sense will alone destroy all he says from the words, which can have no force, till it is made appear they are capable of his sense only, and no other; for if they are equally capable in themselves of either sense, they can argue nothing either way.

Our translators rendering the original so loosely, perhaps gave Mr. Wall occasion to imagine the Greek word is as general as the English; and therefore that the text, speaking of washings in general, might be supposed to comprehend all the washings of every kind; (though by the way, it seems a little harsh to call sprinkling *washing*;) but he is to prove, and not to suppose, that the Greek is of so large a signification. However, if we grant the sacred writer designed by the words all the Jewish purifications, by *sprinkling* as well as by *dipping*; it will no more follow, against the universal use of the word, that it here signifies *to sprinkle*, than that *muero*, for instance, in Latin, signifies *the hilt of a sword*, because it is sometimes put for *a sword*, but strictly signifies only the *point* of it. So here; granting for once that sprinklings are included in the writer's design, yet the word only signifies *dipping*, and is put by a synecdoche *a potiori*, to signify all their purifications, this being one part of them: but it is no consequence, that therefore the word signifies each part singly, or that it belongs as properly to one part as another, or that it ever signifies any of the other parts, without or distinct from this of dipping; which nevertheless, as absurd as it is, is our author's inference. Just as if, because Cicero, in one of his Letters<sup>s</sup>, calls his wife and daughter *charissimæ animæ*, some wonderful critic should thence pretend *anima* in Latin signifies *body* or *matter*, as well as *mind* or *spirit*.

Though the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, Matt. xxiii. 23,

<sup>s</sup> Lib. xiv. Famil. Epist. 14.



by a synecdoche, denotes the whole ceremonial law; yet I suppose our author will not go about to say, ἡδύσμων, the original word for *mint*, signifies *sacrifice*; and that ἀνηθοῦ *anise*, is as properly a *burnt-offering*, and κύμινον, which is rendered *cumin*, comprehends in its signification, the holy water of separation, or the legal sprinklings. In like manner *circumcision* is frequently put for the whole law, and so is *sacrifice*; yet no man can be so inconsiderate as to urge from thence, and insist on such instances, to prove that either of these words signifies what the other does: and yet Mr. Wall's argument from this passage is, at best, no other; for he supposes the words here are put for all the washings, or rather all the parts of the purifications by water; and thence concludes, the word signifies one as well as the other, *sprinkling* as well as *dipping*. And even this is grounded on a very false and precarious supposition, viz. that the original word is of as large an acceptation as the English word by which it is rendered: but the Greek is as much against him, as what I count the more literal and truer English, viz. divers bathings or dippings, would be; for so it should be translated, which every one will say is quite opposite to his supposition; for 'divers bathings or dippings' undoubtedly are not *some dippings* and *some sprinklings*. And this being agreeable to the true sense of the word, till I can see a good reason to the contrary, I must think this place means nothing else.

The last place Mr. Wall mentions is Matt. xxvi. 23; *He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish*, &c.; and all the use he makes of it is only to observe the word does not here mean the dipping of the whole hand. But this is nothing to the purpose: for the question is not about the whole, or a part of the subject, but whether the Greek word signifies only *to dip*, or any thing else. And therefore this is shuffling off the question, and seeming to say something, when in reality he says nothing at all, but even by this tacitly allows all we demand. For all other considerations aside, if it be true that βαπτίζω does only signify *to dip*, it is all we ask, and shall but desire our adversaries so far to acknowledge the truth, and our present dispute is at an end.

There is another fancy of Mr. Wall's which is almost too trifling to be taken notice of; he pretended to establish the sense of the word from these two particulars:

1. The plain application of it in Scripture, to signify to wash, by sprinkling or pouring on water; and this we have been examining.
2. 'That the sacramental washing is often in Scripture expressed by other words besides *baptizing*, which other words do signify wash-

'ing in the ordinary and general sense'. The truth of this observation I shall not go about to question, I grant it is a plain case; but what is this to the business in hand? He is to shew βαπτίζω does signify any kind of washing, and to that purpose he tells you, the sacramental washing is expressed by words which signify to wash in general. And what of that? Why here the force of this argument, if it has any, must lie: the word, which is sometimes used to express the sacramental washing, signifies any kind of washing in general; therefore this sacrament may be administered by any kind of washing. And again, by another 'therefore,' the word βαπτίζω, especially when applied to this sacrament, must, if it agrees to the thing it is applied to, signify any manner of washing too. To discover what admirable logic this is, let us invert his argument thus: βαπτίζω, it is plain, in all other instances, signifies *to dip*, and not one instance can be given where it ever signifies any thing else; therefore the sacramental washing, which is very commonly and indeed most properly expressed by it, (for it is named *baptism*,) was and is to be administered by dipping only. And therefore,

2. All the other words, whatever they are, which are applied to this sacrament, though it were ραντίζω itself, aye, or even σμικρῶς καταπαύω, must signify nothing less than *to dip* likewise.

But the unhappiness of this way of arguing is, that it will equally prove contraries true, and the same thing to be true and false, so that nothing will be gained by it: and thus it falls out with Mr. Wall; he proves by it that βαπτίζω signifies *to pour* or *sprinkle*, or any kind of washing; and after the same manner I have proved that λούω, the word on which he grounds his argument, and all the other words which he will say signify *to sprinkle*, &c., do always and necessarily signify *to dip*, and only to dip.

You see, therefore, this form of reasoning concludes equally on both sides, and consequently in reality it proves nothing at all.

But if it be not a fault to treat so ridiculous a fancy more seriously, let me ask you, whether you can easily imagine that Mr. Wall is himself persuaded there is any thing in what he says; for he must needs know well enough, that words, like our ideas, which they are the signs of, must have their genera and their species: some are of a very large comprehensive notation; but the several things such words comprehend, have besides a more proper peculiar word to be distinguished by, which is not therefore of so large a signification. Take a familiar example: we compassionately say, such a man is a poor creature; but would any one therefore

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. p. 221. [537.]

imagine that the word 'man,' or 'that particular man,' and the word 'creature,' are synonymous terms, equally large and comprehensive in their significations? Could anybody be so absurd as to infer, that the word 'man' signifies any created being, an angel, a horse, a worm, a stock, &c., because the generical word 'creature' comprehends, and is equally applicable to all these? Yet this is Mr. Wall's own argument to a tittle.

Thus, supposing βαπτισμοίς, Heb. ix. 10, does, as he would have it believed, signify any sort of washing, will it follow that the Jewish sprinklings, which he says are meant there, may be performed by any kind of washing; and that the words used in the law for *sprinkle* signify so too? Or because λούω, the same word he argues from here, expresses the legal washings, will he say any kind of washing might be used at liberty; and that it was enough to *sprinkle* those things which God directly commanded should be *put into* the water, Lev. xi. 32; or that במים יובא signifies to wash in general, and to *sprinkle* as well as any thing else, merely because the washings are expressed sometimes by a general word, which comprehends all the kinds of them? It is, I think, much more reasonable to say, that words, to which common use has appropriated a more particular sense, should be allowed to determine what any others have expressed more generally and at large; the words of a more determinate sense giving a more particular and exact account of the matter. The general words may comprehend the particular, not wholly, but only as they also signify to wash; for the latter mean something more than barely to wash, and restrain it to this or that manner of washing. If it is but washing, let it be dipping or pouring, or any thing else, it may well enough be expressed by the general word, though this or that particular mode of washing can only answer the import of the particular word. Thus, though all dipping is washing, and as such is contained under the general word λούω, which signifies simply to wash; yet it does not therefore follow, that all washing is dipping, or that all washings may be expressed by the word which properly signifies to dip; nor that, when two words are used concerning the same thing, as here λούω and βαπτίζω, they are ισούδραμοι, and altogether of the same import, as our author would strangely infer.

For thus Homer speaks of stars being 'washed in the sea', using the same word Mr. Wall here argues from; and yet must be understood to mean their setting in the sea, according to the known

expression of the poets. And therefore when Virgil is speaking of the greater and lesser Bears, and says, They

—————by fate's decree,  
Abhor to *dive* beneath the southern sea\*,

*tingo* here, and *δύνω* in a thousand instances in the Grecian poets, must be interpreted to mean any manner of washing, and may as well signify to *sprinkle*, as to *dip* or *put into*.

I need not repeat the observations of logicians about their *genera* and *species*; yet give me leave only to transcribe one canon from Aristotle: 'The *species* includes the definition of the *genus*, and all that is in it, but not *vice versa*.' Dipping includes washing, but washing does not include dipping; for there may be a washing by pouring, &c. Thus the Christian sacrament, which is to be administered by dipping, which is one kind of washing, may very well be called by the general name (*washing*); but it will in no wise follow, that therefore this general word does comprehend all that is signified by the more particular one, or serve properly to interpret it.

Thus you see, sir, how little there is in what our author says, to make it plain that βαπτίζω does not necessarily and always signify to *dip*.

I hope I have acted very uprightly in examining all his instances, and allowed every thing its due weight, in his behalf. Besides those he mentions, I have likewise considered all other instances that I could imagine might possibly be pleaded for him, which he took no notice of, without concealing any one. And no man, I fancy, will think there are others behind which may be urged with any colour on his side: for such metaphorical passages as Matt. xx. 22, *Are ye able, &c. to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?* and such like places, are so manifestly figurative and obscure, that they cannot be thought to furnish any argument either way, and therefore I pass them by. And what I have farther to add upon this matter I must refer to my next. I am,

Sir,

Yours, &c.

\* —Perque duas in morem fluminis Aretos,  
Aretos Oceani metuentes æquore TINGI.

Georgic. I. 245.

<sup>y</sup> Top. lib. iv. cap. i. Δῆλον οὖν ὅτι τὰ μὲν εἶδη μετέχει τῶν γενῶν· τὰ δὲ γένη, τῶν εἰδῶν οὐ.



## LETTER V.

To appeal to the Scriptures only for the sense of a word, very unreasonable—It is notwithstanding proved from them that the Greek word must always signify *to dip*—What passages may be argued from—Luke xvi. 24; John xiii. 26; Rev. xix. 13—The vulgar copies have lost the true reading in the last—Metaphorical passages make for, not against my opinion—Languages do not exactly answer to one another—If the word βαπτίζω were otherwise ever so ambiguous, yet as it relates to baptism, it is sufficiently determined only and necessarily to mean *to dip*—by the doctrine and practice of St. John—of the holy apostles—of the succeeding church for many centuries, which urged a trine immersion—Learned men in general allow this mode of baptism—Mr. Wall pretends, though the ancients did generally baptize by *immersion*, they likewise used *affusion*, or the like—But this was not allowed in common cases—*Aspersions*, how at first admitted—It is unreasonable to argue that the general sense of a law is the same with the exceptions that are made to it—The ancient church of the first centuries did not practise affusion, &c.—St. Cyprian's plea for aspersion very trifling—All who were baptized in the apostles' times were baptized by immersion—The clinical affusions do not appear to have been introduced till about two hundred and fifty years after Christ: at which time they very much doubted of their validity—By the first patrons granted to be only presumptive—All allow *immersion* was insisted on anciently as the only regular way, in all common cases at least—What to be thought of those persons, who at the same time acknowledge this, and yet plead for what is so certainly and demonstrably false on all accounts—An humble remark on the bishop of Salisbury's plea for changing the manner of administering the sacrament here in England—The clergy pretend they would gladly revive the ancient practice, but they do not take the proper methods; and in reality obstruct its being revived—βάπτω and βαπτίζω synonymous.

---

SIR,

By what I have already said in my former, I believe, it sufficiently appears, that there is nothing in the Scriptures which any way justifies Mr. Wall's supposition; and that whatever he has produced is of no consequence at all: but that you may see, sir, how much reason we have to insist upon it that the word signifies only *to dip*, I would add a farther reflection on this head before I dismiss it.

Our author, that he may evade the force of all that might be said otherwise, appeals to the Scriptures concerning the word, and will be determined by them only in this question; which is so unreasonable a fancy, that I admire any gentleman of understanding should be guilty of it. For the most accurate Greek writers, such as the poets, the grammarians, &c., can undoubtedly give us the true sense of a Greek word as well as the Scriptures themselves, and are as

much to be depended on in that respect: unless it be supposed the Scriptures have strangely altered and wholly changed the Greek tongue, and framed a language to themselves which would unavoidably render them very obscure and unintelligible, and so make them unfit for a rule of faith; because this should be plain and evident to the utmost that the nature of the thing will admit, especially in the most essential points. And such an unaffected perspicuity illustriously adorns the sacred oracles, whatever Mr. Wall may imagine to the contrary. But if our author pleases, I will join issue with him here, and agree, that whatever shall be found to be the plain sense of βαπτίζω in Scripture, that only shall pass for the sense of it in relation to the case before us, the sacrament of baptism.

I have already gone through all those places which can be produced from Scripture in favour of Mr. Wall's opinion, and abundantly proved from the Old Testament, that the signification of the word is always *to dip*. Let us now make as strict a scrutiny through the New, and observe, since it is so plain Mr. Wall's sense is not favoured there, whether any thing appears in it for mine.

Almost all the passages, where the word is used in the New Testament, relate to the sacrament of baptism, and therefore can be of no service in our inquiry; for the question is about the sense of it in those places. However, when it is accompanied with any circumstances that may fix the sense, I shall think it fair enough to urge it on my side. All metaphorical passages also are out of doors, because of their ambiguousness and obscurity; though, if they prove either way, they are against Mr. Wall: and those passages, which relate to the Jewish washings, having been already examined, I will not repeat them, but go on to give you all the instances that may be justly cited in this matter; and they are only these that follow, by which therefore the sense of the word must be concluded.

I begin with Luke xvi. 24, which contains the rich Epicurean's prayer to Abraham in heaven, to *send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool his tongue*. The Greek is βάψῃ. And it can never be questioned, without renouncing common sense, that it is well rendered in our translation by *dip*. Another instance, as full and clear as this, is John xiii. 26, *He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it; and when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot*. In the former part of the verse it is βάψας; but in the Alexandrine manuscript ἐμβάψας, as it is also in the latter part of this verse, and in the parallel places, Matt. xxvi. 23; Mark xiv. 20. It can no more be questioned what is the meaning of these

words in the original, than what is the sense of the English word *dip*, by which they are so properly translated.

It is trifling to enlarge on these, and therefore I go on. The next is Rev. xix. 13, *And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called the Word of God.* This expression is so manifestly taken from the dyer's art, that there can be no difficulty or uncertainty in it: for nothing can appear more natural than to understand St. John as representing the person in his vision to have been clothed with a vesture which was dipped [or as it were dipped] in the blood of his enemies. But this I say only upon the supposition, that the vulgar Greek copies retain the true primitive reading. There are several reasons indeed, to make us think the contrary, and that the word is changed; particularly the authority of Origen, whose writings are older than any copies of the New Testament we can boast of; and therefore what he transcribed from ancienter copies must be more considerable than any we have. Now he, in his Commentary on St. John's Gospel<sup>a</sup>, cites these words from verse 11 to verse 16, inclusively, almost *verbatim*, as they are in our editions; but reads ἐπραντισμένον, *sprinkled*, instead of βεβαμμένον, *dipped*; which makes this passage nothing to our purpose. However, I should not think this single authority of Origen sufficient to justify my altering the word; but I have likewise observed that the Syriac and Ethiopic versions, which for their antiquity must be thought almost as valuable and authentic as the original itself, being made from primitive copies, in or very near the times of the apostles, and rendering the passage by words which signify *to sprinkle*, must greatly confirm Origen's reading of the place, and very strongly argue, that he has preserved the same word which was in the autographa. But besides, if the latter word stands, the sense is evidently what I assert.

These are all the instances I know of in the New Testament, where the word is used according to the vulgar application of it: but there are some, where it is applied to baptism, that are considerably in my favour, and shall be taken notice of by and by. In the mean time you see, sir, our author's rule of interpreting a Scripture-word by its use in Scripture is more to my advantage than his; and certainly I have said enough now to satisfy any man in the world, who has the least pretence to common sense and reason, that the word βαπτίζω does always without exception signify only *to dip*. I have confirmed this at large from the writings of the Greek authors, from the opinion of the best critics, and from the

constant use of it in the Scriptures themselves too; and since all confess this to be its general and most proper signification, we should never, without manifest necessity, depart from it. I believe I have given sufficient reasons also, why metaphorical passages do not determine against me: for it no more follows from them that βαπτίζω does not signify *to dip*, than that *immergo* does not signify so, because Lactantius for example uses that Latin word to signify being *given up*<sup>b</sup> to wickedness: which phrase he borrowed perhaps from Origen, who uses the same exactly in his Commentary upon St. John<sup>c</sup>. Besides, this metaphorical use of the word is very frequent among the Fathers, as well as among the profane authors, as I observed before; for thus Clemens Alexandrinus says, ‘They who through drunkenness are dipped in (βαπτιζόμενοι εἰς ὕπνον) or overwhelmed with sleep<sup>d</sup>.’ The same sense Virgil thus emphatically expresses by a word which properly signifies *to bury*.

Their forces join

To invade the town, o’erwhelmed with sleep and wine<sup>e</sup>.

And Clemens in another place, which is very remarkable, says, ‘And we who were once polluted with these things, are now washed and cleansed. But those who wash themselves in intemperance, from sobriety and a decent behaviour, they immerse, (βαπτίζουσιν,) dip into, or give themselves up to fornication, judging it good to indulge themselves in pleasure and vices<sup>f</sup>.’ And Gregorius Thaumaturgus uses the word much after the same manner in this passage of his Panegyric upon Origen<sup>g</sup>; ‘And reaching his hand to others, he delivers all, drawing them out (viz. of the difficulties, &c.) in which they are as it were immersed (βαπτιζομένους) or overwhelmed.’ We may meet with several such as these in Scripture also, as Mark x. 38. *Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?* Luke iii. 16. *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.* Acts i. 5. *Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.* 1 Cor. x. 2. *And were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, &c.*

Can these or such like passages be thought sufficient to justify

<sup>b</sup> Lib. vii. de Vita Beata, p. 649. Vitiis immersi.

<sup>c</sup> Page 352. Τῶν πάνυ ὑπὸ τῆς κακίας καταβεβαπτισμένων.

<sup>d</sup> Pædagog. lib. ii. p. 155. Ὑπνώδης γὰρ πᾶς, ὃ μὴ εἰς σοφίαν ἐγρηγορῶν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ μεθύσε βαπτιζόμενος εἰς ὕπνον.

<sup>e</sup> Invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam. Æn. ii. v. 265.

<sup>f</sup> Strom. lib. iii. p. 473. Καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν ἀπελουσάμεθα, οἱ ἐν τούτοις γενόμενοι. οἱ δὲ εἰς ταύτην ἀπολούντες τὴν ἀσέλγειαν, ἐκ σωφροσύνης εἰς πορνείαν βαπτίζουσι, ταῖς ἡδοναῖς καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι χαρίζεσθαι δογματίζοντες.

<sup>g</sup> Page 72. Ὅλλοις ὀρέγων χεῖρα διασώζοιτο ὥσπερ βαπτιζομένους ἀνιμάμενος.



any man in denying the word signifies only *to dip*? So far from that, I am certain upon a fair examination it will evidently appear that the natural signification of the word is still the same even in these figures; for the whole vigour and energy of them depends upon it. To argue it does not signify *to dip* from these passages, would be just as ridiculous as if because *πίνω* is used figuratively, Mark x. 37, therefore any one should pretend it does not signify *to drink*; or again, that *βυθίζω* does not signify *to sink, overwhelm, or drown*, because in that elliptical sentence, 1 Tim. vi. 9, *which drown men in destruction and perdition*, as the words stand, it cannot be literally true: but though these words here, and all words some time or other, are thus metaphorically used, they have still one fixed constant sense annexed to them.

There is another thing which perhaps may give some umbrage; I mean, that possibly in some cases the Greek word cannot be so well rendered into English agreeably with our idiom, by any other word than *to wet* or *wash*. But nobody can reasonably from hence infer that the Greek is of as general a signification as the English, by which it is rendered, and stands for any kind of wetting or washing. There are no two languages which so exactly answer as to have no particular word in the one, but the other is provided with a term which signifies neither more nor less, to translate it by. Few people of the same country couple the same complex ideas to the same word, as is evident by most controversies, which have no other original; much more therefore may two several nations different in manners and time, be supposed not to have equivalent words to express a complex idea unvaried. Thus *navigo*, in Latin, will be very often translated into English, *go*, better than by any other word we use; as, ‘in Galliam aut Belgium navigare,’ to *go* to France or Holland. But it cannot be argued therefore, that *navigo* is of an indeterminate sense, and may equally mean to go either on foot or horseback, by coach or by water; for it always necessarily signifies the last manner of going, and never any other. Again, *suspicionem movere* is literally *to move suspicion*; and in more proper English, *to give umbrage*. But no man in his wits will go about to argue from hence, that *movere* signifies in general *to give*; and that *heredes movere*, which is *to expel the heirs*, may be translated, *to give heirs*: for though in both phrases *movere* means the same thing in itself, namely *to move*; yet it must be rendered into English by words contrary to one another, viz. *to give*, and *to expel*. And the reason is, that the sense of it must be accommodated to the subject it is applied to, and understood accordingly. And though it strictly

signifies *to move*, yet as it is joined with other words, it must be differently turned; for the same action produces different effects according to the subject it acts upon. Thus when *movere* is joined with *suspicionem*, it signifies ‘to move, give motion and action to ‘suspicions, to set things in a ferment, and cause them to work in ‘the mind.’ But though the word here properly enough signifies *to move*, this sense cannot be better expressed in English than by the words I before made use of, viz. *to give umbrage*. But then, when these two words, *hæredes movere*, are joined together, the same sense of the word expresses the same action and motion, which yet has a different influence on the subject: for to *move* an heir is to put him aside out of the way, from the possession of his inheritance; for these words *ab hæreditate* seem to be implied. To conclude this matter: it is plain by these examples, and you know it would be easy to give a thousand more, that though the genius of our language may oblige us sometimes to render βαπτίζω, *to wet*, or *wash*, or *dye*, &c., it is most absurd to infer that it therefore signifies any thing else besides or different from *to dip*; whereas it appears to include *dip*, and means *to wet*, or *wash*, or *dye*, &c., only by dipping.

If any particulars I have insisted on above should be thought too trifling to deserve arguing about, I am however to be excused; for it must be considered, that Mr. Wall and others having urged them against us, it was necessary on that account to give them an answer.

And if what I have said should not carry full conviction to any, so as to finish this part of the controversy, yet methinks it is the most reasonable thing in the world to allow, that though the word had been ever so ambiguous in itself, and extensive in its signification, yet as it relates to the sacrament of baptism, the sense is plainly enough determined in Scripture to be *to dip*, by several circumstances; and that the doctrine and practice of St. John, our Saviour himself, and his apostles, and the primitive church, are sufficient to ascertain how it must be understood and practised; therefore let us hear how the Scripture confirms this particular in our behalf.

That St. John baptized by dipping is as plain as a thing can well be; and were it not for the daring tempers of some men, it would be trifling, in such an excess of light, to attempt to prove it. But because I shall be allowed to say nothing without a demonstration, I refer you to John iii. 23, which will remain unanswerable, until somebody, by a mighty stretch, can find some other turn than has

been yet thought of, for the holy penman's giving this as the reason of his baptizing in those parts, *Because there was much water.* Dr. Whitby on the place says, 'In which their whole bodies might 'be dipped;' and adds, 'in this manner only was their baptism 'performed.' If any other wetting would have served, this had been impertinent, and no reason at all; for there is no habitable part of the world but would have furnished water enough for that purpose.

Again, Mark i. 5, *And were all baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.* Which, I pray you, is most natural to suppose, that the river was poured or sprinkled on them, or they dipped into the river? If it was not the first, it must be the last; for nobody can bring himself to imagine they were poured or sprinkled on the river, or the river dipped into them. And Mr. Wall himself owns St. John baptized our Lord thus. And this shews what was his method in baptizing. What now can have a greater face of truth, than to think our blessed Saviour, when he appointed this ordinance of baptism, meant the same thing exactly, and understood and intended the word in the same sense that it was known generally and most properly to be used in, and which was fixed to it by the public practice of the person from whom he continued the ceremony?

When people had been used for some time to a religious baptism, which was performed by dipping, they could not possibly understand our Lord to mean any thing else; and if he had designed a different manner from that of St. John, he would doubtless, at least, have avoided a word which from St. John's example, if it were nothing else, was liable to be restrained to *dipping* only. But since he has used the same word, which, besides its natural import, was limited to this sense by the practice of St. John, in this very ceremony, and has given us no manner of caution against restraining it to this sense; it follows, that we must in justice allow this alone to be what our Lord intended by it; and accordingly, which carries the thing much farther, the holy apostles, and the first Christians, it is plain understood it so. Their practice will surely be granted a very good commentary on Christ's institution, and an unexceptionable rule to guide us in setting this matter in its true light.

Hardly any man of learning will deny the Christians of the first times used dipping, and that in obedience to our Saviour's commission. Thus, when Philip baptized the eunuch, great treasurer to Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, it is said, Acts viii. 38, *And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him.* I take this to be a plain case, notwithstanding

the little frivolous cavils that have formerly been made against it ; and the propriety of the words separately in themselves, and much more in this particular construction, necessitate us to understand them in the sense I maintain.

Besides, there are likewise many allusions which the apostles make, that cannot possibly be understood of any thing but dipping into the water. Grotius noted this before ; and undoubtedly the inference is very just. You may read him on Col. ii. 12, where those who had been baptized are said to be buried with him (viz. our Lord) in baptism, &c. Dr. Hammond, in his paraphrase of this verse, and of Rom. vi. 4, does expressly fix the justness of the allusion in the practice of immersing and dipping persons into the water, which, he allows without any difficulty, was the way at that time. And Dr. Whitby says, ‘ It is expressly declared here, that we are buried ‘ with Christ in baptism by being buried under water ;’ or, as he words it in his paraphrase, ‘ plunging us under the water ;’ which, as he intimates, represented ‘ the putting Christ’s body under the ‘ earth.’ And indeed the apostle’s words, Rom. vi. 3, 4, are so very clear to this purpose, that we need only open our eyes and read them, to be convinced ; *Know ye not, says he, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death ? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death ; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*

The Apostolical Constitutions give the sense thus : ‘ Baptism is a ‘ representation of Christ’s death ; the water is that wherein we are ‘ buried<sup>h</sup>.’ And a little after, ‘ The immersion is the dying with ‘ him ; and emersion, or coming up from under the water, represents ‘ the resurrection.’ And therefore Tertullian likewise says<sup>i</sup>, ‘ We ‘ die symbolically in baptism :’ upon which words Rigaltius remarks, ‘ We are immersed as if we suffered death, and rise up out of the ‘ water, as reviving again<sup>k</sup>.’

And it is worth while to transcribe a passage from St. Chrysostom, where he says, ‘ To be dipped and plunged into the water, ‘ and then to rise out of it again, is a symbol of our descent into the ‘ grave, and of our ascent out of it : and therefore Paul calls baptism ‘ a burial, when he says, we are therefore buried with him by ‘ baptism into death<sup>l</sup>.’

<sup>h</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 17. Τόλυν τὸ μὲν βάπτισμα, εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διδόμενον. τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἀπὲρ ταφῆς. et paulo post : ἡ καταδύσις, τὸ συναποθανεῖν ἡ ἀνάδυσις, τὸ συναναστῆναι.

<sup>i</sup> De Resurrectione, p. 354. Per simularum enim morimur in Baptismate, &c.

<sup>k</sup> Mergimur, quasi mortem subeamus. Emerginus, ut reviviscentes.

<sup>l</sup> Rom. 40. in 1 Cor. tom. iii. page 514.



I argue further, that this continued to be the practice of the primitive Christians, and of many centuries together. St. Barnabas says in his Epistle, 'We descend into the water full of sins and 'defilement, and come up out of it<sup>m</sup>,' &c. Tertullian almost constantly uses *tinguere, mergitare*, &c., which signify *to dip*, and *immerse*, as properly as he could possibly express it: and in his treatise concerning baptism he has these words, which describe at the same time the custom of that age, and what they took to have been the practice of St. John, &c. 'It is all one,' says he, 'whether 'we are washed in the sea or in a pond, in a fountain or in a river, 'in a standing or in a running water; nor is there any difference 'between those that John baptized in Jordan, and those that Peter 'baptized in the Tiber<sup>n</sup>.' In another place he says, 'Our hands are 'clean enough, which, together with our whole body, we have once 'washed in Christ<sup>o</sup>.' And Gregorius Thaumaturgus, speaking of the baptism of Christ, uses *κατάδυσον*, *plunge* or *dip*, as a synonymous word for *βάπτισον*, *dip, plunge* me into 'the river Jordan<sup>p</sup>.'

Nay, so far were they from contenting themselves with any thing less than dipping, that it is notorious they very strenuously pleaded for and insisted on a trine immersion. Thus Dr. Beveridge, late bishop of St. Asaph, explains the forty-second of those canons that are ascribed to the apostles; which rigidly enjoins, 'If any bishop 'or presbyter shall administer baptism only by one immersion into 'the death of Christ, and not by three immersions, let him be 'degraded<sup>q</sup>.' And Tertullian most expressly says, which evidently demonstrates what was the custom in his time, 'We are immersed 'not once, but thrice, viz. unto each PERSON as he is named<sup>r</sup>:' or, as the rubric of the present Greek church expresses it, 'At each 'compellation putting him (viz. the baptized person) down into the 'water, and raising him up again.' St. Cyril of Jerusalem says very emphatically, 'plunge them down, *καταδύετε*, thrice into the water, 'and raise them up again<sup>s</sup>.' Monnulus, bishop of Girba, in his

Τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι, εἴτα ἀνανεῖν, τῆς εἰς ἕδου καταβάσεώς ἐστι σύμβολον, καὶ τῆς ἐκείθεν ἀνόδου. διδὲ καὶ τὰ φων τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ Παῦλος καλεῖ λέγων, συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον.

<sup>m</sup> Cap. xi. pag. 38. "Οτι ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες, &c.

<sup>n</sup> Cap. 4. Ideoque nulla distinctio est, mari quis an stagno, flumine an fonte, lacu an alveo diluatur. Nec quicquam refert inter eos quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit.

<sup>o</sup> De Orat. pag. 133. Ceterum satis

mundæ sunt manus, quas cum toto corpore in Christo semel lavimus.

<sup>p</sup> In Theophan. pag. 35. Κατάδυσόν με τοῖς Ἰορδάνου ρείθροις.

<sup>q</sup> Εἰτὶς ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μίας μνήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἐν βάπτισμα τὸ ἐς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω.

<sup>r</sup> Adversus Praxeam, cap. xxvi. pag. 516. Nam nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in PERSONAS singulas tingimur.

<sup>s</sup> Catechet. Mystagog. cap. ii. pag. 232. Καὶ κατεδύετε εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύετε.

suffrage, which is the tenth in St. Cyprian's account of the council of Carthage, calls it *baptismatis Trinitate*, says the learned bishop of Oxford<sup>t</sup>, 'because it was celebrated by a trine immersion.'

Instead of more citations from the Fathers, give me leave to mention some of our learned moderns, who upon very nice examination confirm this to have been the practice of the earliest times. And this I choose rather to do, because at the same time it shews, not only that I am right in my assertion, but also that the most learned and judicious critics acknowledge and confirm the truth of it, which is a double advantage.

Dr. Beveridge, whom I named but now, at the beginning of his annotations on the fiftieth canon, and in his Vindication of the Canons against Daillé, largely asserts the trine immersion. So does the learned Dionysius Petavius, in these words: 'Their wonted manner of administering this sacrament was to plunge the persons baptized thrice into the water<sup>u</sup>,' &c. And the celebrated Johan. Gerard. Vossius speaks to the same effect in his *Etymologicon*, at the word *baptismus*. Casaubon on Matt. iii. 6, says, 'The form of baptizing was by plunging into the water<sup>v</sup>,' &c. The passage is quoted above at large. Episcopius, in his answer to *Quæst.* 35, tells us, 'Those who were baptized by the ceremony of plunging into the water, and rising out of it again, declared themselves to be as it were dead<sup>x</sup>,' &c. Mons. Jurieu assures us, in his Pastoral letters, that the ancients 'used to plunge persons into the water, calling on the adorable TRINITY<sup>y</sup>.' And in another place, 'Because baptism was then administered by immersion<sup>z</sup>,' &c. And a little after, 'He that was baptized was plunged into the water<sup>a</sup>.'

Mons. Le Clerc, whom you so deservedly honour for his great learning, says the same thing on Rom. vi. 4, 'The manner of baptizing at that time, by plunging into the water those whom they baptized, was an image of the burial of Jesus Christ<sup>x</sup>.'

The learned antiquary, Mr. Archdeacon Nicholson, at present bishop of Carlisle, in his letter to sir William Dugdale, concerning

<sup>t</sup> [Sec Cypriani Opera, edit. Fell. p. 232.]

<sup>u</sup> De Pœnitentia, lib. ii. cap. i. § 11. Ratio autem solita administrandi hujus sacramenti erat, ut ter in aquam immergerentur qui baptizabantur.

<sup>v</sup> Hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus, ut in aquam immergerentur, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Pag. 34. Nam ii qui baptizabantur, ritu isto immersionis et emersionis testabantur se mortuorum instar esse, &c.

<sup>y</sup> Let. v. an. 1686. pag. 36. On se con-

tentoit de plonger les personnes dans l'eau, avec l'invocation de l'adorable Trinité.

<sup>z</sup> Let. vi. an. 1686. pag. 42. Parce qu'alors le bême se faisoit par immersion, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Celui qui étoit bême, étoit plongé dans l'eau.

<sup>x</sup> La manière que l'on avoit alors de baptizer, en plongeant dans l'eau ceux que l'on baptizoit, étoit comme une image de la sepulture de Jésus Christ.

the font at Bridekirk in Cumberland, as it is published in the 'additions to Mr. Camden's Britannia,' takes notice, 'There is fairly represented on the font a person in a long sacerdotal habit dipping a child into the water.' And presently remarks on it thus: 'Now, sir, I need not acquaint you that the sacrament of baptism was anciently administered by plunging into the water, in the western as well as the eastern part of the church; and that the Gothic word **Ἀντιγα**, (Mark i. 8, and **Ἀντιγαν**, Luke iii. 7, 12.) the German word *tauffen*, the Danish word *dobe*, and the Belgic *doopen*, do as clearly make out that practice as the Greek word βαπτίζω.'

I will give you but one citation more, which is too remarkable to be omitted. It is Dr. Whitby's Annotation on Rom. vi. 4. 'It being so expressly declared here, and Coloss. ii. 12, *that we are buried with Christ in baptism*, by being buried under water: and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this *immersion* being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our church, and the change of it unto sprinkling even without any allowance from the author of this institution, or any license from any council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use.' What follows concerning aspersion being not to the purpose, I omit it.

If you please you may see more instances of this nature in Mr. Stennet's Answer to Russen, and particularly those taken out of sir John Floyer; but these, I think, are enough to put it past doubt, that the apostles and primitive Christians did baptize only by immersion; and that this rite continued in the church for many centuries.

To evade the force of this, Mr. Wall is willing to compound the matter with us; and allows, they did generally baptize by immersion: but then in some cases, as in danger of death, &c., he pretends they thought affusion or sprinkling sufficient; and that in such cases it was actually permitted. In answer to this, I say:

1. Supposing these exceptions to be well grounded, and that aspersion was suffered in cases of necessity; yet even then it must follow, that according to the sentiments of the ancients, it was utterly unlawful to use aspersion in any common cases, or at all, but in such necessity: for they never thought themselves at liberty

Y Page 841. [or Gough's edition, iii. p. 183. Compare what is said on this subject, vol. i. p. 54, and p. 358 text and note.]



to administer this sacrament in what manner they would, as our author pleads; and that to baptize, as he will have it, is to wash in any manner: and it is still plain, that a general, and much more than a total disuse of immersion, is the greatest affront to those pious saints, and the whole primitive virgin church, that can be well offered; and it must be no small presumption, to fancy Christ did not enjoin what they so strictly and universally practised.

It is not to be imagined, the pious primitive Fathers, and the whole church of that time, could be guilty of the absurd folly of tying themselves up so unnecessarily, and even contrary to what, according to Mr. Wall, they knew to be the sense of the word, and the design of Christ. This is not at all consistent with his pretended veneration for the Fathers, nor his building his darling paedobaptism so entirely on this foundation. I cannot think they would commit such innovations so early: but if Christ had intended, and the word he expressed himself by had implied, that baptism might be regularly administered by one kind of washing as well as another, they would doubtless have 'stood fast in that liberty,' for some time at least; whereas, even though Mr. Wall's supposition be true, that in some cases of necessity they did dispense with immersion, yet it is plain they held dipping the only general regular way, which nothing but endangering a man's life could make them supersede. This appears from St. Cyprian, the earliest advocate for aspersion; which nevertheless he pleads for only in extraordinary cases.

And it seems at first to have been admitted upon this notion, that *God will have mercy and not sacrifice*; which they understood to mean, that all positive institutions must give way to the eternal obligation of moral duties. So David, from the necessity of preserving his and his followers' lives, made free with the shewbread, in opposition to the positive command; and our Saviour himself vindicates his disciples from the same principles, and from this example of David, Matt. xii.

This foundation is certainly very good; and they might from hence justify their forbearing to administer this sacrament at all, in such cases, where it is apparent it could not be administered without violating some unchangeable moral duty. But the ancients, who introduced sprinkling or affusion, seemed unwilling to carry the matter so far. In present danger of death they thought it necessary that all should be made partakers of the salutary illumination, without which, they imagined, it would be impossible to obtain salvation; and yet they feared, lest baptizing them according



to the institution might, considering their weakness, occasion their death, and so they should become guilty of murder. To avoid both inconveniences, they thought it best to divide the difficulty; and rather than dispense with the whole sacrament, to make this alteration in the manner of its administration only; which after all was in reality no better than nullifying the whole: for if Christ commanded only *to dip*, as themselves vehemently urge, in all cases where it can be safely complied with, then nothing but dipping is obeying the institution. But they thought it was better to retain some, though but a distant shadow, than to part with the whole ceremony; in hopes God would indulge them in this change, which they were driven to by necessity, as they thought; and that he would annex all those spiritual advantages to it, which should have attended a more regular administration. At most, they only pretended affusion might serve, where immersion could not, as they imagined, take place so well. And this is formally to acknowledge, that, strictly, the institution required immersion only; as most naturally follows from their rigorous insisting on it in all ordinary cases, and allowing affusion as an exception to the rule, upon some emergence where the rule could not be so conveniently obeyed.

Now, no serious reasonable man can be so much overseen, as to think it just to interpret a law by the exceptions that are made to it, any further than to infer the exceptions are different from the law, and opposite to it, the true sense of which should be determined by the ordinary cases it is supposed only to respect.

Though the thing is plain enough in itself, yet having found by experience how unreasonably some men can cavil as to this point in particular, I thought there was need enough to dwell so long upon it, and make such frequent repetitions. On the same account, I must take the liberty to illustrate what I said in the last words by an example, which, if possible, may yet make it more plain what it is I mean. Your good sense and candour, sir, I am sensible would save me the trouble; but you tell me my letters shall be shewn, and I do not know who may be my readers: out of precaution therefore, if any of them should think the matter not sufficiently clear, I desire they would consider, whether because the Quakers, by a clause in some Acts, are excused from swearing, they can think the design of the law was to make it indifferent in all cases, whether any man in general took an oath, or only made the affirmation; and that it should be at the liberty of every one to choose? The Toleration Act binds all persons whatever, not to molest the protestant dissenters in the free exercise of religious worship according to the dictates of

their consciences: but at the same time, by a clause purposely inserted, it provides, that no ‘papist or popish recusant whatsoever,’ or any person that shall deny, in his preaching or writing, the ‘doctrine of the *Blessed Trinity*, shall have any ease, benefit, or ‘advantage thereby.’ Now, can it be imagined from hence, that the full sense and tenor of this act is, that those who are in power have liberty hereby given them, either to tolerate or disturb, as they please, persons dissenting from the established church?

I will compare these instances, to shew they are exactly parallel.

1. The Fathers (on whose practice we are now chiefly arguing) for some centuries, made immersion necessary and indispensable in all ordinary cases. This is so undeniable, that our adversaries allow it; and that, so far as the practice of the primitive Church is our rule, we are obliged, in all ordinary cases, to baptize by immersion. To this, in the instance given, answers the general tenor of the act, viz. that protestant dissenters shall be tolerated in the free exercise of religious worship according to their own way.

2. The primitive Church, as it is supposed, has made an exception to this her general practice, and allows of affusion, to those who are in present danger of death, instead of immersion. So the Act excepts, together with ‘papists and popish recusants, all such as ‘shall deny, in preaching or writing, the doctrine of the *Blessed Trinity*,’ to whom it means no protection.

Since the cases then are so far parallel, I might conclude, it is as unreasonable to argue from the exception the ancient Church is supposed to have made in some cases of necessity, that they therefore thought themselves at full liberty always to administer this ordinance by any kind of washing, (which is Mr. Wall’s argument,) as all the world knows it would be, because of that exception made in the act, to infer, that the design and true meaning of it is to oblige all persons to tolerate the dissenters, or disturb them, as they please.

At the same rate it will argue further too, that if those who deny the Trinity, in whatever communion, are not to be tolerated, therefore none is under any obligation to tolerate any of that communion, then the Church of England herself cannot so much as make any pretence to toleration neither: for there are some of the rankest Socinians in her bosom that ever appeared. See what strange work Mr. Wall’s art of reasoning would make: but I will leave it to be studied and practised by himself only. As it would be nothing but bantering the Act, and the royal authority which gave it sanction, to argue upon it at this rate; so it must needs make that man appear very ridiculous, who can seriously pretend to argue, that

because the ancient Church thought baptism might be administered by affusion in some cases, therefore they thought it might as well be administered so in all.

The ancient Church sufficiently intimates the strictness of the law required immersion, and that she understood this to be the sense of Christ in this commission he gave to his apostles; since they had no other authority to urge for making immersion so indispensable in ordinary cases. And as to that exception, it is beyond all controversy, they doubted the validity of it themselves; and it is certain, there is no room for it in the commission, if the command to baptize cannot be obeyed without immersion, as they declare it cannot in ordinary cases. Nor does this same command allow aspersion, or direct to it: and we know of no exception made in the text, nor of any command besides this general one.

The Church of England, and, if our author be right, which I must examine hereafter, the apostles, and primitive Christians too, always admitted infants to baptism, without requiring of them a personal profession of faith, supposing them to be excepted when Christ commanded to baptize those that believe. Now, if this should be granted to be true, would any man be so wild as to infer, that therefore it is indifferent, whether *any* believe and make a profession of their faith before they are baptized; and that Christ has left it entirely to the discretion of every one, whether he will require a public profession of faith from *all* he baptizes, or from *none*, or from *some* only? This is most exactly Mr. Wall's way of arguing.

But thus far I have gone upon the supposition that the apostles and primitive Church did use aspersion: in the next place, I say,

2. This supposition is utterly false and groundless; on which account, there is still much less, or rather no force at all in the objection. No man living, I am sure, can shew me any foundation for it in Scripture: Mr. Wall does not attempt it; but only insinuates in general, that notwithstanding it is plain from the example of St. John's baptizing Christ, &c., that 'they did in those hot countries baptize ordinarily by immersion; it does not follow, that in cases of sickness, or other such extraordinary occasions, they never baptized otherwise<sup>d</sup>.' So resolved he is to hold his opinion, that he dares make even the silence of Scripture an argument for him. He forgot, it is likely, his own rule to judge of the sense of a Scripture word by its use in Scripture; for by the same reason that the Scripture is thought to be of sufficient authority to determine the sense of a word, it is much more of authority to determine what

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. p. 219. [536.]



was the practice in relation to an ordinance of Christ; and we ought to acquiesce in the account it gives, and not rashly suppose what is not so much as in the least hinted at.

To the words above cited our author immediately adds, ‘Of this I shall speak in the next chapter.’ This filled me with expectation of something which might have an appearance of probability at least; but when I came to the place, nobody was ever disappointed more; for I met with little else but instances from the later centuries: Mr. Wall seems to have forgot his promise, and never goes about to prove that any were baptized in the apostolical times otherwise than by plunging. St. Cyprian, indeed, in his letter to Magnus, endeavours to justify aspersion by several passages in the Old Testament, after a very frivolous manner; and what but tenaciousness of an opinion could put any one on the extravagant method of determining the manner of administering a Christian sacrament by obscure passages in the prophets, and by words in the law, which manifestly relate nothing at all to the matter? Nay, which makes the thing still worse, from these passages alone he determines the matter, not only without, but directly contrary to the whole tenor of the New Testament.

Observe here, that this conduct of St. Cyprian is a very plain confession, that there is nothing to favour his notion in the New Testament; and that the sense of the word in our Lord’s commission, and other places, is limited so as not to admit of *pour* or *sprinkle*; for otherwise Magnus could not have made a question concerning the validity of aspersion; or if he had, the answer had been very ready and natural, without recourse to the mysterious types and allusions of the Law and the Prophets, viz. to have said, That the common practice of the apostles, &c. sufficiently justified that manner of administration, and more especially, that the general signification of the word used in the commission comprehended that manner as well as any other.

It is matter of wonder to me, that St. Cyprian should so misapply those texts, and that the learned Dr. Beveridge should so easily give into the error, and venture to say, ‘that St. Cyprian had largely proved, and that from the Scriptures themselves too, that baptism might be rightly administered by aspersion<sup>c</sup>.’ I will lay one of that Father’s proofs before you, sir, that you may judge of the force of his reasonings.

He quotes Numb. xix. 13. *Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle*

<sup>c</sup> In Canon. Apostol. 50. p. 408. b. med.



*of the Lord ; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel ; because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him.* What man that ever lived, of a common imagination, nay or of the most luxuriant fancy, could have supposed that these words have any respect to a Christian sacrament, or infer from them that it should be administered by sprinkling ? But I consider, warm zealous men often see with eyes very different from what other men see with, especially such as are mystically given ; for they make mysteries of every thing, and see every thing in their mysteries. So some great headpieces, of a most profound invention to be sure, have discovered both sacraments in the words of the spouse, Canticles vii. 2, *Thy navel is like a round goblet, which wanteth not liquor : thy belly is like an heap of wheat set about with lilies.*

A gentleman, who is one of the zealous writers of our time, has improved this in a very surprising manner ; and since he has ventured to publish it to the world himself, it can be no crime in me to transcribe the passage in a private letter to a friend : ‘ And by the ‘ by,’ says he, ‘ here is a great controversy solved, namely, between ‘ us and the anabaptists, who are against the baptizing of children ‘ because they are not come to years of understanding. Let it be ‘ remembered, from what is suggested to us here, that infants (ac- ‘ cording to the notion which prevailed in those days) receive ‘ nourishment by the navel, though they take not in any food by the ‘ mouth ; yea, though (according to the opinion of those times) they ‘ did not so much as use their mouths. So it is no good objection ‘ against baptizing infants, that they are ignorant and understand ‘ not what they do ; and that they are not able to take in the ‘ spiritual nourishment after the ordinary way ; if it may be done ‘ (as it is said here) by the navel, by that federal knot or link which ‘ ties them fast to their Christian and believing parents : which, ‘ according to the best divines, is an unanswerable argument to ‘ prove the validity of infant-baptism ; for they belong to the ‘ covenant as they are the offspring of the faithful ; and thence are ‘ pronounced holy by the apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 14. And here also we ‘ see further the congruity of the expression here used by the wise ‘ man : for the use of the navel is not only to convey nutriment to ‘ the fœtus, but to fasten the fœtus to the mother ; which denotes ‘ that intimate union and conjunction with the church of Christ, our ‘ common mother, that is made by the baptismal performance<sup>f</sup>.’

Whatever the doctor may think of this fine invention, barely to repeat such chimæras is to confute them : and I believe we shall

<sup>f</sup> Dr. Edwards' Exercitation on Canticles vii. 2. p. 136, 137.

none of us think it worth while to take any further notice of this mighty 'solution of the controversy.'

Though I have a great respect for the primitive Fathers, and all learned men; yet their loose expositions and misapplications of Scripture are not to be endured. The citations of St. Cyprian, beside the unfairness of them, run counter to the history of the New Testament, and the primitive church; for as to the apostles themselves, they declare that all who were baptized in their time were baptized by immersion. Nothing can be more express to this purpose than Rom. vi. 3, *As many as were baptized*, i. e. all, without exception, who were baptized *into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death*; and this he calls, verse 4, *being buried with him by baptism*. So that it is as plain as words can make it, that so many as were baptized into Christ were buried with him by baptism; and, none, I believe, are hardy enough to deny that this means, they were plunged into the water in their baptism. Dr. Whitby, in his Annotations, judiciously observes on the place, that 'the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his (Christ's) death, by dying to sin, is taken from hence, that we were buried with him in baptism, by being buried under waters.' Now as he, from this and other reasons, advises to restore the ancient manner of administering the sacrament among us; I infer from it also, that as the duty of conforming to Christ's death, by a death to sin, obliges all in general; so the argument to enforce it, and persuade to it, should extend to all in common; and the holy apostles, undoubtedly, accommodated their reasonings so as to be conclusive to all. And since the whole stress of St. Paul's argument lies in the propriety of the representation of Christ's death and burial, made in baptism; his logic would not have reached to any who had been baptized by affusion, and the like. But as he seems plainly to design, from the consideration of their being buried with Christ by baptism, to persuade all in general to conform themselves to his death; so it seems necessary to suppose from hence, that all were then, and, that the argument may not be rendered useless, should be now, *buried with him by baptism*, by being plunged into the water; for on no other supposition can the apostle's words be consistent with good sense, or of any force to us now.

It may be said, though the apostles and Christians of their time did not baptize except by immersion, yet their immediate successors in the whole church did, and allowed of affusion, at least in some cases. To this I answer:

1. That though it were true, as it is far from being so, yet having

gained this point, that the apostles themselves, who were the master-builders of the true church under Christ, never authorized it, we are safe enough in resolving not to vary from their unexceptionable practice. We desire to be followers of them, even as they were followers of Christ; and we prefer their authority to all their successors, in opposition to them: and therefore if Mr. Wall should be able to make out his assertion, that the whole church, after the apostles' time, did allow of affusion, we may nevertheless think ourselves obliged to withstand it as an ancient corruption; for error should not be privileged by age. But,

2. The assertion is not true; and Mr. Wall's way of proving it would make one think he knew it was not: for he never attempts to cite any instances till about two hundred and fifty years after Christ, which is one hundred and fifty after the apostles, according to his own computation; that is, from the death of St. John, who lived till more than a hundred years after the birth of Christ. So that in all this space of time, he points us to nothing, from which it can be so much as suspected that baptism was administered by any other way than immersion. Dr. Beveridge<sup>h</sup>, I know, quotes Tertullian, who died about anno Dom. 220, but this is not early enough neither; and besides, it is very plain to any one that reads the passage, that it does not speak of baptism: '*cujuslibet aquæ*' is an invincible bar against that sense; which signifies any sort of water, in opposition to that of baptism, and not the water of baptism itself; for the sense lies manifestly thus: 'You are so far,' says the Father, 'from being fit to be admitted to baptism, that nobody would give even a sprinkling of common water to a man of such fallacious and uncertain penance.' I find Rigaltius takes it much to this purpose too, and adds, that 'it is apparent trifling to understand these words of aspersion in baptism: for wherever he speaks of baptism, he uses the words *lavacrum, tingere, intingere, ablui, mergitari, and immersio*, which do not at all signify aspersion.' This, if it be considered, is an argument that Tertullian knew of no custom in his time, of baptizing by aspersion, or any thing else but dipping. And the other Fathers deliver in as full evidence on our side.

Afterwards, indeed, about the middle of the third century, I own there is mention made of this manner of administering, or, to speak more properly, of eluding the sacrament. Mr. Wall<sup>k</sup> instances in the case of Novatian, near two hundred and fifty years after Christ;

<sup>h</sup> In Apostol. Can. 50.

<sup>i</sup> Splendide nugantur qui hæc verba de baptismo per aspersionem accipiunt. Nam ubicunque de baptismo sermonem facit,

lavacrum dicit, et tingere, et intingere, et ablui, et mergitari, et immersionem, quæ sane adspersionem minime significant.

<sup>k</sup> Part ii. p. 292. [571.]



and confesses this is ‘the most ancient instance of that sort of baptism, that is now extant in records!’ This acknowledgment is pretty fair, and in effect to own he has no reason to say this sacrament was administered by perfusion, &c., till about two hundred and fifty years after our Saviour. But to have been truly impartial, he should have given notice, that even at that time, they much doubted of the validity of this mode, as evidently appears by the very passage Mr. Wall cites; which shews the judgment of that time was, that one who had been baptized by affusion in sickness on his bed, could not be lawfully admitted to any office in the church: which is the same thing as to say, he was not on a level with others who were baptized more regularly. Our author fetches the reason of this from a canon of the council of Neocæsarea, which however was not made till eighty years after, and therefore cannot be justly brought as any, much less the only reason of an opinion that prevailed so long before. On the contrary, it is clear, as Valesius notes, that ‘this baptism was thought imperfect for several reasons.’ Petavius says, ‘Such were thought irregularly baptized, and were ‘never admitted into holy orders<sup>m</sup>;’ attributing it to their perfusion.

There is a remarkable passage relating to this matter, which an unbiassed writer ought not to have omitted; but it shews the judgment of that time was not very agreeable to our author’s hypothesis. Cornelius, the sitting bishop of Rome, after mentioning Novatian’s case, who had been baptized in his bed by perfusion, (for they feared he would instantly die, says the letter,) very frankly adds, by way of caution and distrust, ‘if such a one may be said to be baptized<sup>n</sup>;’ which intimates he made a question of it, and that he had no good opinion of that manner of administering the ordinance. And any one would think this was the reason why he afterwards says, ‘It was not thought lawful for any who was baptized in his bed, because of sickness, by perfusion, to be admitted to any charge ‘in the Church<sup>o</sup>.’ And this is confirmed by the learned bishop of Oxford, when he says, ‘Novatian was obnoxious on two accounts: ‘first, because he had made a schism on account of the lapsi; and ‘secondly, because, though he had water poured on him in bed, yet ‘he was not baptized<sup>p</sup>.’

<sup>l</sup> Part ii. p. 295. [574.]

<sup>m</sup> De Pœnitent. lib. ii. cap. i. § 11. Ea lege ut qui sic baptizati fuerant irregulares haberentur, nec unquam in sacros ecclesiæ ordines admitterentur.

<sup>n</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 43.

Εἵ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι.

<sup>o</sup> Ὅτι μὴ ἐξδὸν ἦν τὸν ἐν κλίνῃ διὰ νόσον περιχθέντα, εἰς κλῆρον τινα γενέσθαι, &c.

<sup>p</sup> In Cyprian. Epist. 69. p. 297. Duplici nomine obnoxius videbatur Novatianus; primo, quod in causa lapsorum schisma fecerit: secundo, quod in lecto perfusus, non autem baptizatus fuerit.



Constantine the emperor seems to have been unwilling to trust to the validity of these clinical perfusions, as we may gather from Eusebius' account of his baptism. And the pious prince himself, in his speech to the bishops, wherein he desires them to baptize him, tells them, 'he had hoped to have been made partaker of the 'salutary grace in the river Jordan;' but a violent fit of sickness, which he rightly apprehended would conclude his life, made him look for that happiness now no longer. But notwithstanding the danger of the distemper, which actually killed him in a few days, the historian assures us<sup>q</sup>, he was not baptized in his bed, but, as was usual, in the church, called *Martyrium Christi*, in the ordinary way, by Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia; and with great tranquillity of mind soon after expired. But can it be imagined, if perfusion or aspersion was at that time thought so well of, as it is now pretended, that in so dangerous a case, that good emperor, though an old man, should, without any care or tenderness, be baptized in that way they accounted the most inconvenient and unnecessary? No, doubtless, the great respect the bishops had for him would have inclined them to persuade him to receive baptism in the safest way imaginable.

I observed, that Cornelius, in the above-mentioned letter to the bishop of Antioch, adds, as the sole reason of their taking the liberty of baptizing by perfusion, their supposition that Novatian would quickly die, and not a direct permission in Scripture; which is the same excuse St. Cyprian palliates this practice with: and though he pleads so much for it, he only pretends it was to be allowed of 'in case of urgent necessity<sup>r</sup>;' hoping to come off with this fancy.

But this way of baptizing was even then so rare and uncommon, that Magnus, though a diligent inquirer into religious matters, was perfectly ignorant of its having ever been usual or allowed in the Church; and rather seems to take it for granted that this case had not occurred before: and therefore he only asks St. Cyprian's opinion about it, what he thought best to be done in it, since neither the practice of the church, nor the Scripture, afforded any rule. Accordingly, St. Cyprian answers only as from his own private opinion, which he seems to give as in a dubious point, as appears from his words, which Mr. Wall translates thus<sup>t</sup>: 'You

<sup>q</sup> Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 62.

<sup>r</sup> Cogente necessitate. [p. 186. edit. Fell.]

<sup>s</sup> Cyprian. Epist. 69. initio.

<sup>t</sup> Cyprian. Epist. 69. p. 297. Quæsitum est, fili carissime, quid mihi de illis

videatur qui in infirmitate et languore gratiam Dei consequuntur, an habendi sint legitimi Christiani, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sint, sed perfusi. Quia in parte nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quo minus unusquisque

‘inquire also, dear son, what I think of such as obtain the grace in time of their sickness and infirmity, whether they are to be accounted lawful Christians; because they are not washed all over with the water of salvation, but have only some of it poured on them. In which matter, I would use so much modesty and humility, as not to prescribe so positively, but that every one should have the freedom of his own thought, and do as he thinks best: I do, according to the best of my mean capacity, judge thus,’ &c. This answer, sure, is far from determining as if the matter were notorious and certain: and the whole sum of all he says to the purpose is, that God may, in urgent necessity, dispense with the strictness of the law; for he adds, when, as it were, he draws up the conclusion: ‘In the sacraments of salvation, the shortest methods of performance, under a pressing necessity, (not else by the way,) do, by God’s gracious indulgence, confer the whole benefit<sup>u</sup>.’

I think it is considerable, and well worth our notice, that Cornelius and Magnus saw nothing in Scripture to abet this practice, nor understood our Lord’s institution, or any words or phrases, to be of a latitude to countenance it; nor that clinical affusions were ever used or favoured in the history of the apostles, or of their successors. If they had, they could not have questioned their validity: and St. Cyprian, so willing as he is to have the thing admitted, does not argue from any of these heads, which is particularly to be observed. For it is known he was a warm man, and a great friend of the power of the clergy; of a lively genius: and therefore certainly would never have neglected these mighty arguments, which are so directly to the purpose; and have contented himself with only speaking doubtfully of the matter, and citing a text or two, to shew that aspersions were in use under the law: and then, after all, refer it to the determination of every one, who, he says, might lawfully think and act in the case as he should judge fit; which is placing the whole validity in the bishop’s determination. No, this is not like St. Cyprian at all; he doubtless would have pleaded the practice of the apostles. With what a grace and energy might he have replied to Magnus, in the words he uses on another occasion: ‘If we look back to the head and origin of divine tradition, the errors which are of human original will cease; and from thence, the nature of the celestial sacraments being well understood, whatever was obscured

quod putat, sentiat, et quod senserit, faciat. Nos, quantum concepit Mediocritas nostra, æstimamus, &c. [p. 185. edit. Fell.]

<sup>u</sup> Page 298. In sacramentis salutari-

bus, necessitate cogente, et Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt divina compendia. [p. 186. ed. Fell.]

‘with mists, and hid in clouds of darkness before, will then appear in its true light<sup>x</sup>.’ And a little after: ‘Thus it becomes the priests of God to do, who would keep the divine law. If the truth at any time be shaken, or uncertain; let us look back to the divine evangelic origin and apostolic tradition,’ &c. And further, he would not have failed briskly to urge our Saviour’s meaning, and the large sense of the word βαπτίζω, had he found them to be on his side. This had been sounding the matter to the bottom, and solving the thing at once, in the most direct way that could be thought of, and beyond any possible reply. But that he should wholly neglect this, and reason only from the sprinklings under the law, hunting out farfetched inferences, doubtful presumptions, very little or nothing to the purpose, and then leave the case so uncertain at last, is an argument to me, that neither Christ, nor the apostles, nor the church, were believed, even in St. Cyprian’s time, to have known or permitted these clinical affusions, &c. But I am the more confirmed in my inference, from this consideration, that the rest of the church, and all the Fathers that have lived in it, as well as St. Cyprian, till lately, have had the ingenuity to waive those other topics, and defend affusion, &c., alone by the hope of God’s indulgence toward them, in altering that circumstance only in a case of necessity; and never dared attempt to justify it from Scripture, or the practice of Christ and his apostles, as now for some time has been done. For Mr. Wall cannot find an ancient writer who will pretend, with him, that baptism may be administered indifferently in any manner; much less any who argues from the signification of the Greek word, or any passage in the Christian canon, that affusion, or the like, is good or regular baptism: on the contrary, it appears they always insisted much upon immersion; and in a very ancient council, held here in England, under Kenwulf king of the Mercians, anno 816y, it is expressly ordered, that baptism shall not be administered by sprinkling, but by dipping. But what need is there to urge this, since our author allows that the opinion of the necessity of immersion, at least in ordinary cases, continued in most parts of the world, especially in England, for a long time; and still prevails in the Greek church, and, as he observes, wherever the pope has had no

<sup>x</sup> Epist. 74. p. 317, 318. Nam si ad divine traditionis caput et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus; et sacramentorum cœlestium ratione perspecta, quicquid sub caligine ac nube tenebrarum obscurum latebat, in lucem veritatis aperitur. *Et paulo post*: quod et nunc facere oportet Dei sacerdotes præ-

cepta Divina servant; ut si in aliquo nutaverit et vacillaverit veritas, ad originem dominicam et evangelicam, et apostolicam traditionem revertamur, &c. [p. 215. edit. Fell.]

<sup>y</sup> [See Synodus Calceuthensis, cap. xi. apud Wilkins Concilia Mag. Brit. tom. i. p. 171.]



power; seeming to attribute the alteration to the liberty which he took and taught?

By this, sir, I would satisfy you, that the church, even when it had admitted affusion, which it did only in necessity, never pretended, as Mr. Wall does, to ground it on the words of Christ, or on ecclesiastical practice: and this implies that they do in effect deny, against our author, that it could be defended from thence. So that we have the reason of the thing, and the testimony of all antiquity, as Petavius says<sup>z</sup>, with the concurring authority of the whole church for many ages, against our author in this point.

Thus I have made it plain, from the constant use of the word βαπτίζω in the Greek authors, the Seventy, and the New Testament, and from the authority of the best critics and most learned men, that it always signifies only *to dip*, or *plunge*, &c., and likewise that St. John, our Saviour, the apostles, and the whole primitive church, constantly taught and practised accordingly; and that afterwards, when the church took the liberty to admit sprinkling or affusion, it was thought imperfect and irregular, and allowed in cases of necessity only, on a bare presumption of God's indulgence. To which I added, that the church never went about, till lately, to justify affusion, &c., by the doctrine, or by the practice of Christ, the apostles, and primitive times. From all this therefore it strongly follows, that baptism ought constantly to be administered by *immersion* or *dipping* only; and that affusion, sprinkling, or the like, are groundless, unwarrantable, and very dangerous corruptions: and that it is as good sense to say a man is dipped, when only a drop or two of water falls on him, as to say he is baptized, when he is only *sprinkled*.

Suffer me to put the question here: since the clergy allow, in general, dipping was the ancient manner, universally practised by St. John, by Christ, his apostles, and the whole church, for a long time together, and insisted on as the lawful and regular way, necessary in all common cases at least; and that the primary sense of the Greek word is *to dip*: nay, since they have wished this custom might be again restored among us here in England, as it continued till about queen Elizabeth's time; why, after all these concessions, &c., do they pretend it is indifferent, and that baptism may be rightly administered any way; presuming with Casaubon, 'the force and energy of this sacrament is not placed in the 'manner'<sup>a</sup> of its administration? and why do they continue in the

<sup>z</sup> Loco supra laudato.

<sup>a</sup> In Matt. iii. 6. Cum non in eo posita sit mysterii hujus vis et ἐνέργεια.



constant use and practice of aspersion, &c., and defend it, in opposition to immersion?

Here I am necessitated humbly to take notice of the excuse which the most judicious and learned bishop of Sarum has thought fit to make, for changing the manner of baptizing by *dipping* into that of *sprinkling*. His lordship is pleased to observe on the twenty-seventh article, that the primitive way of administering baptism, was 'to lead them into the water,' &c. 'and first lay them down 'in the water,' &c. 'then they raised them up again,' &c., which is a most express acknowledgment, that immersion was the true primitive manner; but yet afterwards, on the thirtieth article, page 346, he says, 'The danger of *dipping* in cold climates may 'be a very good reason for changing the form of baptism to '*sprinkling*.' This excuse is now become very common, and however insufficient it may seem in itself, has gathered considerable force by being used by men of his lordship's good sense and learning. But however great and honourable the patrons of a mistake may be, they are but men; and the authority of Christ, and the respect and obedience we owe to his commands, should counter-balance all other considerations: and his lordship's own words a little after, against communicating in one kind only, had been much more suitably applied to the sacrament of baptism, than those above cited, and are a full answer to them. It is with abundance of pleasure I learn from his lordship, that 'An institution of Christ's 'must not be altered or violated, upon the account of an inference 'that is drawn to conclude it needless. He who instituted it knew 'best what was most fitting and most reasonable; and we must 'choose rather to acquiesce in his commands than in our own 'reasonings<sup>b</sup>.' Thus does his lordship admirably argue, with that force and solidity that eminently appears in all his lordship's writings.

It is pretended the clergy would gladly revive the ancient practice, and desire, according to the direction of the rubric, to baptize by *dipping* all that are willing to receive it in that manner, and able to bear it. But if this pretence be real, why do not they take proper methods (unless they think it a trifle not worth their care) to recover it, and put down sprinkling; to reform an error, which will but grow stronger, and increase by continuance? for when no other argument can be found, antiquity and custom will be pleaded. If the clergy would, according to their declared judgment in the case, heartily endeavour to recover the true primitive prac-

tice, I am well assured they could not possibly fail of success: for I know that many, and I believe the greatest part of the Church of England, take their opinion of aspersion from the authority and practice of the reverend clergy; it being observable, this is the main thing they urge in its defence. So that notwithstanding their pretences, it is to be feared the clergy are a great cause of the corruption, and its continuance. And how they will ever be able to answer this to God or their own consciences, I know not, but heartily wish they would take it timely into consideration.

I do not know, sir, whether you will except against my taking the words *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω* for synonymous. Some have formerly made a wide difference between them, allowing the first indeed to signify what we contend for, but maintaining that *βαπτίζω*, being a derivative with a termination which they call a diminutive, does not signify so much as *βάπτω*; but I think it is plain from the instances already mentioned, that they are *ισοδύναμοι*, exactly the same as to their signification; though some (as Tertullian seems to have done when he rendered it by *mergitare*, and Vossius and Stephens) take it for a frequentative, which signifies more than the derivative, and not less; as in English, *to dip over and over again*. Besides, Mr. Wall seems to allow them to be synonymous, because he argues promiscuously from both. But I need not enlarge upon this; for all who are any thing acquainted with the Greek tongue know the common criticism to be nothing but a ridiculous piece of pedantry. I will however subjoin a few instances in the margin<sup>c</sup>, to shew, derivatives in *ζω* signify the same as their primitives; which you may examine at your leisure. I am,

Sir,

Yours, &c.

## LETTER VI.

THE other chief article in dispute between the baptists and their adversaries—They continually repeat the most trifling objections, though they have been fairly answered over and over; which has made it necessary to say a great deal to what has been well enough answered already, and concerning things which are very plain of themselves—The late handling of this controversy has convinced the world, the baptists are not that unreasonable sect they were represented to be; and it is not to be doubted but the reviving the dispute at present may go far to open people's eyes yet much more in their favour—It is pity some friendly measures are not taken to compose the difference, which is not so impracticable as some fancy—Mr. Wall's attempt, though the best in its

<sup>c</sup> Βλῆω, βλῦζω. Θύω, θυάζω. Βορβορόω, βορβορίζω. Ὀρκάω, ὀρκίζω. Ἀλέγω, ἀλε-  
γίζω. Καναχέω, καναχίζω. Ἔθω, ἐθίζω. Ἦθω, ἡθίζω, et infinita alia.

kind, falls very short of answering the design of it—His scheme—He first allows it cannot be made appear from Scripture that infants are to be baptized; and therefore recurs to these as the only expedients—1. To the practice of the Jewish church—2. To the practice of the ancient Christians—Some reflections which overturn all he says as to his main conclusion, though he should prove these two points ever so solidly—From his concession, that it cannot be proved from Scripture, it unavoidably follows, that it is no institution of Christ—And to suppose it may be included in some of the more general expressions, is only to beg the thing in dispute—Unless he can shew us infant-baptism is so much as mentioned in Scripture, we shall not believe it is instituted there—Our author makes the Scriptures the rule of language; which he therefore ought with much more reason to make the only rule of his faith and practice—The baptism of infants is unlawful, if Christ has not instituted it—True protestants should adhere to the Scripture, as the only infallible guide in all religious controversies—They who do otherwise seem to be too near the church of Rome, as to the article of tradition at least; which is an inlet to all the rest—Our adversaries act very inconsistently in rejecting tradition, in their disputes with the Romanists, while they recur to it as their main refuge in the present dispute with us—That infant-baptism ought not to be practised, is proved from our author's principles, compared with the Articles of the Church—It gives the Romanists a handle to weaken the reformation with too much advantage—The Articles of the Church directly against traditions—The Scripture's silence as good an argument against *pædobaptism* as can be desired—We find a strong tendency in our minds to depend upon the Scriptures only—We are obliged by any sort of law, &c., only to the particulars the said law expresses—This illustrated by instances, and by an undoubted maxim from Tertullian—Applied also to the present dispute, and illustrated by more instances—Some build the ecclesiastical hierarchy mainly on that very foundation on which the baptizing of infants is opposed—Mr. Wall sometimes argues in the same manner as the baptists do against *pædobaptism*—The objection, that Christ nowhere forbids us to baptize infants, answered—We are forbid to teach the traditions of men for commandments of God—The *pædobaptist's* argument enervated by Tertullian—Though the Scripture's silence may sometimes, it does not always, leave it so much as lawful to do what it does not mention.

---

SIR,

Now we have taken breath a little; if you please, sir, we will enter upon the other chief article in dispute between us and our adversaries.

If Mr. Wall, like some others, had argued with a great deal of concern, that it is unlawful to dip those who are baptized, because it is a breach of the sixth commandment, and virtually to murder; undoubtedly you would say this could not have deserved an answer, and yet it could not fairly have been passed by neither.

Of the same kind exactly, or it may be more trifling, are the two main foundations of infant-baptism, I mean the celebrated arguments from original sin, and from circumcision; which have been so often and fairly baffled, and yet are continually returned upon us as gravely, as if nothing had ever been said to them.

And if I should be necessitated to make a formal answer to these and some other such pretences, you know where to lay the fault, though I design to avoid it all I can.

We were once taken for a very strange sort of people, and accordingly were furiously attacked without any moderation; but our adversaries at length thought fit to let the controversy drop, the effect of which has been only to persuade the world we are not that unreasonable, mischievous sect we were represented to be. And it has been made appear, that we have abundantly more to say for ourselves than was believed or expected. This has been the only consequence of the warm handling of this controversy not long since. And I do not doubt but the more it is canvassed, the more people's eyes will be opened in our favour; and therefore I am not displeased some go about to revive the dispute again.

I only wish a more impartial and learned examination of these matters might be seriously entered on; for it is highly necessary points of this nature should be determined, if possible. And, I think, it lies on our adversaries, either to renounce their error, or else to justify themselves more solidly, by setting things in another light.

I should be heartily glad if some amicable measures might be concerted, in order to compose the difference, and put an end to the dispute. Perhaps it is not a design altogether impracticable, and I am sure it would be very useful, if it should be managed in that becoming manner, in which we are convinced by a late glorious instance, I mean that of the Union<sup>d</sup>, that the most nice and difficult points may be treated and adjusted with success. But it is observed, ecclesiastics are too often subject to the same passions with other men.

In the meantime let us examine Mr. Wall's attempt, which I have owned is the most considerable of any thing I have seen of the kind: for he has amassed together the substance of all that can with any show of reason be insisted on: and thus he lays his scheme.

He first very freely allows, (and indeed what unprejudiced man would venture to assert the contrary?) that it cannot be made

<sup>d</sup> [The *Union* of Scotland with England was brought to a conclusion in the year 1707.]





meantime I will make a reflection or two, which I think will take off the force of all he says to establish his general conclusion, viz. that Christ commanded to baptize infants; even upon the supposition that he proves these two particulars ever so solidly.

And first, you may be pleased to observe his concession, which is a very unhappy one for him; for indeed it does most effectually ruin the cause he asserts; it being an unavoidable consequence from it, mangle all his other attempts, that infant-baptism is no institution of Christ; and if so, though all the Jews and Fathers in the world have practised and maintained it ever so laboriously, we shall not think ourselves under any obligation on that account to do so too; because we profess not to be followers of them, but of Christ alone.

St. Cyprian, the darling author of our warmest adversaries, and the ancientest patron of infant-baptism, has a very remarkable passage to this effect, which is worth transcribing. Some in his time made so free with the other sacrament, as to presume to use water only instead of wine; for which too it seems they pleaded antiquity. And the Father answers them thus: ‘If in that sacrifice which Christ offered, none but Christ is to be followed, then certainly we ought to obey Christ, and do what he commanded us to do; since he says in the Gospel, *If ye do what I command you, henceforth I call you not servants, but friends.* And that Christ only is to be obeyed, even the Father witnesses from heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.* Wherefore, if Christ only is to be our guide, we are not to regard what some others before us have rashly presumed to do, but only what Christ, who is before all, first practised. We are not to follow the customs of men, but the truth of God; for God, speaking by the prophet Isaiah, says, *In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*’ And a little after he concludes, it is very dangerous ‘to change any thing by human traditions, from what it was at first by divine institution.’

But it will be expected I should make out the conclusion I drew from our author’s concession. I do not desire to take any thing for granted which I can imagine may be in the least doubted of, even by any man who would be thought reasonable.

Mr. Wall confesses, all the passages in Scripture relate to the baptism of adult persons, and gives this as a reason why the antipædobaptists are so successful in their public disputations. ‘Having plain places of Scripture,’ says he, ‘to produce concerning adult-baptism, and several examples of it; they work much on such of the people as had not minded this before, and had not had a right

‘state of the question between the pædobaptists and the antipædobaptists: wherein the former grant that in a nation newly converted to Christianity, (and such are all the cases mentioned in the Scripture,) the adult people must be baptized first, before their infants can be baptized!’ But this he supposes is no proof that therefore their infants were not to be baptized at all.

To this let us add what I cited before<sup>k</sup>; where he allows, first, ‘that there is no particular direction given what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith, [whether they should be baptized or not]!’ and secondly, that ‘among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant.’ And the consequence from the whole put together must be very strong, that even upon his own principles there is as little ground for infant-baptism in the Scriptures, as there is for any thing whatever of which that sacred rule is totally silent.

Nay, on the contrary, and as he himself proposes the matter, the advantage lies considerably against him on our side; the great evidence and plainness of the truth, which renders it so obvious to every man, obliging him to confess, that there are in the Scriptures many plain places and examples which make entirely for adult-baptism, while no single passage can be found there, which even he himself dares say makes plainly for the baptism of infants, who are not so much as once mentioned where baptism is spoken of.

Now to say that in proselyted nations the adult are first to be baptized; and that all the cases in Scripture are of this kind; and that therefore all the passages of Scripture which speak of baptism are to be understood particularly of adult-baptism; and farther, that there is no example nor direction of any kind, that infants ever were or ought to be baptized: what is all this, but a full and explicit confession that the Scriptures are wholly silent in this matter, and know nothing of infant-baptism at all?

But because this would be granting too much, our author, to moderate the force of it, supposes (and indeed it is at best but a supposition) in some general expressions infants are to be included, as in the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19; and perhaps other passages elsewhere: and John iii. 5, which he reckons<sup>m</sup> the plainest argument for infant-baptism, and, with the ancient pædobaptists, the chief ground of it. But to affirm infants are intended as well as

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. page 276. [557.]

<sup>k</sup> [Preface, near the beginning.]

<sup>l</sup> [The words which I have enclosed

within brackets are not in Dr. Wall.]

<sup>m</sup> Part ii. page 122. [443.]

adult in these and such like places, is begging the question, and asserting the thing instead of proving it.

It is true, Mr. Wall, to do him justice, has not done so; but sparing the assertion, he would seem to propose it as a thing in itself a little doubtful, and therefore goes about to clear it up, from the practice of the Jews and primitive Christians; which however we shall see hereafter make nothing for him.

In the mean time, unless he can shew us, at least by good consequence, that infant-baptism is so much as mentioned in the Scriptures, we shall not believe it is instituted there, though we are told it ever so often. But whatever may be pretended at other times, thus much most plainly and necessarily follows from, or rather is the very sense of, our author's words above cited, viz. that as to infant-baptism in particular, the Scriptures are wholly silent; and all he pretends is, not that he sees it by any necessary inference, but only that *probably* it may be comprehended in some of the more general passages; that is, in short, they are fully resolved to find it somewhere; but I think it much more *probable*, that if it had been an institution of Christ, it would have been mentioned in some passage of holy writ, as well as we see adult-baptism frequently is. However, we are not to take up with suppositions and bare assertions; and therefore, if our antagonists would convince us they must not surmise, but plainly shew us that infant-baptism is indeed contained in the Scriptures; for if it is not there, we regard no other authority, and therefore shall not think ourselves much concerned to account for our rejecting it.

I should not have insisted on this so long, but only that it shews Mr. Wall has ruined his whole design by what he lays down at first: for if infant-baptism cannot be found in Scripture, as he confesses; then it ought not to be practised, especially in the stead, and to the excluding, of that which is plainly instituted in it.

You may remember, sir, that our author would allow of no other way to determine the sense of the Greek word βαπτίζω, than by observing how it was used in the Scripture. So that when he fancies it may be serviceable to him, the Scripture must be the only rule even of language. It is the rule we know of our faith and practice, and was designed for that; but not to be the standard of speech, which is continually altering, and depends upon custom. If Mr. Wall therefore will needs have us refer ourselves entirely to the Scriptures for the sense of a word, it is much more reasonable, I hope, to determine all controversies by them, that relate to the Christian religion, which is instituted by God, and contained in



those sacred books. If infant-baptism then is not to be found in Scripture, no Christian is obliged to practise it. This inference is drawn wholly from Mr. Wall's own premises, and therefore I take it for an unanswerable argument, at least *ad hominem*, as they call it.

And further, this topic proves not only that we are not obliged to practise the baptizing of infants; but, on the contrary, that it is unlawful to do it. The case of the Jews was parallel; of whom Christ says, Matt. xv. 6, *Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition*: and afterwards applies to them these words of the prophet, *But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*. For (as St. Mark vii. 8, adds) *laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do*. Nay these words are much more severe upon the pædobaptists now, than they were upon the Jews then; for they had the command of God for washing of cups, &c., in some cases; and this washing of cups, &c. did not jostle out any other religious duty: whereas the pædobaptists have not the least countenance from God for infant-baptism at all; which has nevertheless, through the prevailing power of custom and interest, too generally, but it is to be hoped not past all probability of recovery, superseded the one primitive, true, apostolical baptism, of which only it is confessed the Scripture speaks, viz. that of adult persons upon profession of their faith: which is a thing very rarely seen or heard of now in the greatest part of the Christian world, their traditionary pædobaptism being substituted in its room.

Methinks the gentlemen, our antagonists, whose authority and example, I must say, *delude* the people (who generally plead nothing else but the authority of their spiritual guides in defence of this practice) into this error, should more closely consider those awful words of St. Paul, Gal. i. 9, *If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed*. A dreadful sentence, and not pronounced in vain! And Christ himself has promised to confirm the sentence of his apostles, John xx. 23, *Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained*. They would do well to consider, whether teaching a different, that is, another baptism from that which is so plainly taught in the Scriptures, does not fall under this anathema. For my part, I cannot but think the teaching and practising any thing not contained in Scripture, as a Commandment of God, especially if it sets aside something that is plainly to be found

there, must, at least in some measure, seem to fall under the condemnation in these words, unless where ignorance may be pleaded in excuse.

Such as are true friends to the protestant cause ought always to have particular regard to that which is the chief corner-stone in its foundation; which is, to have no other rule of faith, or judge of controversies, beside the sacred word of God. For if once we admit of any other, we directly give up our cause, and expose ourselves to all the impositions and inconveniences which are the inseparable attendants of popery.

This our most reverend and wise reformers knew perfectly well, and therefore piously used all endeavours to have the Bible, as the best rule, published in the English tongue; but not without the violent and powerful opposition of the partisans of Rome, who knew it was the most effectual way to ruin their kingdom of darkness and superstition, in which they had such considerable interests. It has but an odd aspect then, for any here among us to offer to advance another rule besides the Scriptures, in matters of this kind; though perhaps they may not intend or see the ill consequences of it; and I would hope and believe they do not: yet still, to imitate the actions of those who at first *per fas et nefas* opposed our glorious and happy reformation, seems at least to bespeak that those who do so are much in the same interest, as to the point of tradition at least.

But all I will at present infer from it shall be only the inconsistency of our antagonists' principles, in rejecting tradition, and appealing to the Bible as the sole authority, when they dispute against the papists; and in building at the same time the baptism of infants only on the pretended tradition of the church. That is, they will discard tradition when it is against them; but if it will serve to support any particular doctrine or usage they are fond of, then it must be admitted.

Our author at his ordination, in the most solemn manner, declared upon oath his free and full assent to the Articles of the Church of England; and therefore I may take them for incontestable principles with him, and indeed with the whole clergy of that church. Now the sixth article, you know, sir, declares, 'That whatsoever is not read therein, (viz. in the holy Scriptures,) nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' The words of the learned bishop of Sarum

on this passage<sup>n</sup>, which he indeed aims against the church of Rome, are so applicable to another church too, in reference to the point in controversy between her and us, that I shall take leave to transcribe some of them. 'If this is our rule,' says his lordship, 'our entire and only rule, then such doctrines as are not in it ought to be rejected; and any church that adds to the Christian religion, is erroneous for making such additions, &c. So all the additions of the five sacraments, of the invocation of angels and saints, &c., of the corporeal presence in the eucharist, &c., with a great many more, are certainly errors, unless they can be proved from Scripture.'

And so likewise is paedobaptism, which Mr. Wall confesses cannot be proved from Scripture: and what the right reverend bishop adds is as true of this as of any of those errors he has mentioned; of which he says, 'they are intolerable errors, if as the Scripture is express in opposition to them, so they defile the worship of Christians (I forbear to add, as his lordship does, with idolatry). But they become yet most intolerable, if they are imposed upon all that are in that communion; and if creeds or oaths, in which they are affirmed, are required of all in their communion. Here is the main ground of justifying our forming ourselves into a distinct body from the Roman church; and therefore it is well to be considered.'

His lordship very necessarily added these last words; and it is great pity that matter is so little considered: for had it been more strictly observed, the reformation would have been long since carried to a much higher degree of perfection, and every evil work, and every thing which offends, taken away: whereas the want of adhering to 'the main ground' of the reformation has unhappily afforded the Romish party an opportunity to give it some terrible shocks.

They have often, and with great advantage, argued from infant-baptism; which, they strongly assert, is only grounded on the tradition of the church; and therefore will always remain an unanswerable argument for tradition, against all such as admit of that practice. To this the reformed divines have yet never made any solid answer; and those passages which Mr. Stennet, in answer to Russen, has translated from the ingenious Monsieur Bossuet, will be a standing unanswerable objection to the paedobaptist protestants, and cannot be solved but by flinging up infant-baptism, or else by shewing it to be founded on Scripture, which nevertheless, it is

<sup>n</sup> [See Burnet on the Articles, Art. vi. p. 78.]



confessed, cannot be done : and the anonymous answer to the bishop of Meaux ingenuously acknowledges, that ‘ the passages produced ‘ do at most only prove, that it is permitted, or rather that it is not ‘ forbidden, to baptize infants.’

And who now would imagine that protestants should so generally, and that too after they have been often reminded of it by the most learned prelates, and others of the Romish communion, their adversaries, still continue to practise what is so well demonstrated to be erroneous, I may say unlawful ; especially since it gives the Romanists such a handle to pursue this example on their side in establishing what corruptions they please, and abrogating any of our Saviour’s laws ? For their inference is undoubtedly very just, that if tradition and the church’s authority be a sufficient ground for altering one sacrament, it must likewise be sufficient to justify any changes made in the other, though it be the denying the cup to the laity ; and it will be a sufficient warrant also to introduce as many other sacraments as they think fit to invent : and thus *confirmation, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and matrimony*, are proved to be as properly and truly sacraments, as the two which Christ instituted, viz. baptism and the eucharist.

But our prudent reformers, in order to deliver us effectually, and prevent all after-attempts from the Romish church, made it a fundamental article of their new constitution, which all the clergy at least are obliged indispensably to give their free assent to upon oath, that traditions, &c., are not to be admitted as a rule.

The whole sixth article, it is plain, and more directly those words a little before transcribed, were intended, as my lord of Salisbury does yet more fully explain and apply them, against that dangerous error of the Romish church, which is, as it were, the foundation of all the rest. This article declares against setting up any other rule of faith, of any kind whatever, in competition with the canonical books of the Old and New Testament : and all who enter into orders do forswear any other.

But how Mr. Wall, or any man who owns infant-baptism cannot be maintained but by the traditions of the church, and yet practises it ; I say, how any such person can excuse himself of prevarication, or something worse, is what I cannot divine. I believe if Mr. Wall was to attempt it, he would find the difficulty not easily surmounted. In the mean time I think it is plain enough, that even the articles of that very church our author defends, condemn and disallow his method, which nevertheless he thinks is the only one whereby he can hope to defend pædobaptism.



But all this is only arguing *ad hominem ab absurdo*. Suffer me now to offer some few observations, which naturally arise from the silence of the sacred Scriptures, and may serve to make out yet more fully, that this is so far from being a fit groundwork for Mr. Wall to build upon, that it is as good an argument against him as can reasonably be desired.

All Christians pay so high a veneration to the Scripture, that where they have the liberty to express their thoughts, they appeal to it as the only guide in all points of religion. All parties are so convinced of the sufficiency and authority of it, that they are concerned to found their opinions, though ever so mistaken, upon it, and never think them safe till some texts or other are brought to speak in their favour. Our experience may satisfy us, whatever reasonings and arguments are employed to support any thing, we are apt to raise scruples and doubts, if we do not see it confirmed by holy writ.

And in the nature of the thing it must be so: for the Scriptures being the records of revealed religion, nothing can be our duty but what they enjoin; and consequently, we are to take no notice of what is not expressed in them.

All laws in general are understood to bind only in relation to the particulars severally specified in them. This is self-evident, and it is too absurd to be made so much as a supposition, that they are obligatory in cases they have no relation to, and which they do not so much as mention. An act which makes it treason to contrive the death of a king, does not at the same time make it equally capital to contrive the death of the meanest subject, but on the contrary, rather supposes the latter not to be equally capital. Had it mentioned beggars too, or been put in such general expressions as comprehended them, or all men, then the case would have been the same: but one case being mentioned and not the other, makes one criminal, and the other not; one being against an express law, which has no relation to the other.

All commissions, and warrants, &c., do as it were appropriate the duties or privileges they impose or grant, only to those persons and circumstances severally therein mentioned; and at the same time tacitly imply they are not to be construed as obliging any other persons, or even the same in other circumstances than those expressed. For when any powers specify some particulars, they are understood to relate to those only, and to exclude all others. All grants and gifts, whether by the crown or any other authority, are made to this or the other particular person or family; and the bare

mentioning of them is a sufficient cutting off all other pretences whatever. The commissioning judges to try such and such causes, is not only not authorizing them to judge other causes, but a tacit forbidding them to do it: for though the commission gives a power to judge and determine, it is understood to be with this restriction, viz. only the things mentioned; so far it gives power to go; but it does not give, which is the same as to withhold or refuse, the power to go further. And accordingly it is accounted criminal, and a high contempt of the superior authority, to exceed the bounds of a commission, barely in doing what it does not mention. From all this I think it is more than sufficiently plain, that the silence of a law-giver, &c., in any case, is understood to be a prohibition against the said things he is silent in; especially if some other particulars be expressed, and that omitted, for then it looks as if it were designed, and has therefore something more negative in it.

It is a sure maxim of Tertullian, *negat scriptura quod non notat*°. A maxim so fatal to the causes which depend on tradition, that Le Prieure could not safely pass it by, without boldly accusing this ancient writer of heterodoxy.

To apply this to our present dispute: since the Scripture, in all the places where it speaks of baptism, is confessed to speak only of adult persons, and never once to mention infants; one would think it should be an unavoidable consequence, that therefore the adult only which are mentioned, and not infants which are not, should be looked upon as fit subjects of baptism. If adult-baptism only be mentioned in Scripture, then infant-baptism to be sure cannot be grounded upon that sacred law: and to draw a home inference, it must be unlawful to baptize infants under pretence of Divine authority, and as by commission from Christ, since it appears to be contrary to, or at least different from, his intention, which was, that adult persons should be baptized: and, as appears from the frequent mention of adult, and the total silence about infants, that this sacred ordinance should not be profaned, by admitting such unfit subjects to it.

This negative conclusion must be as strong here as in all other such like cases. So the patent by which his Grace was created duke of Marlborough, and the settlements made for the suitable support of the said dignity, are an honourable acknowledgment of his invincible courage and wise conduct, and of his unshaken loyalty and faithfulness, and indefatigable industry in the service of his

° De Monogam. p. 527. [of the edition by Priorius or Le Prieure, fol. Par. 1664.]

Queen and country, and the whole protestant interest. The bare mentioning his Grace, together with his heirs, without mentioning any other, appropriates this honour to his Grace's family only, and to his heir after him, who alone, of all the children, would be entitled to the honour, notwithstanding the rest are not expressly mentioned, and denied it: and the reason which excludes the rest, is only because they are not mentioned in the patent: and so exactly on the same account infants are not to be baptized, viz. because they are not mentioned in those clauses of our Scripture-patent which relate to the high privilege of baptism. Again, every man of but common sense will allow, that all obligations bind only those persons who are mentioned, and upon those conditions only which are expressed. If I am bound in a bond of ten thousand pounds for my friend's fidelity in any post, I shall not be accountable on any other pretence, as of his unfitness for the place, or the like; nor is any other person answerable for his frauds, &c., no other condition being mentioned in the bond beside his fidelity, nor no other man made a joint security with me.

Just for the same reason, to a tittle, we think baptism should not be administered to infants: for it is beyond dispute, that the only persons mentioned in the *baptismal clauses* of Scripture are the adult; and the only condition, faith and repentance. By all which, infants seem to have been as designedly excluded this sacrament as could well be. And though the inference in this particular case will be pinching, and therefore ungrateful enough to our author, he will nevertheless readily allow, in some cases which agree with his system, that negative arguments are not always invalid.

On some occasions which might be pointed at, I know he would subscribe Dr. Whitby's general rule, that 'in matters of doctrine the argument is always good: we read of no such doctrine in the Scriptures, therefore it neither is nor can be any article of faith, because we have no other rule of faith besides the holy Scriptures<sup>p</sup>.' The doctor's reason makes the observation appear certainly true, and therefore gives the cause of pædobaptism a more deadly wound.

And indeed, it is mainly on this foundation the ecclesiastical hierarchy is at present built: for the appointing officers in the church to administer the sacraments, for instance, our author himself, and almost all Christians will allow, is a tacit prohibition that no other person presume to do it. In like manner the mentioning

the adult in the commission to baptize, and not infants also, is as strong a prohibition not to baptize the latter.

When we were last together, you may remember, sir, you took occasion to intimate, that probably Mr. Wall would not stick to reject this way of arguing, if any should urge it upon him. But I observe, when he writ his history, he had so good an opinion of it, as to use it himself. For when he has made the supposition that the Jews did baptize their proselytes, together with their children, and that our Lord transferred that practice from them into the Christian church, he adds, to clinch the nail he has been driving, and infer infants must now in like manner be baptized, ‘If our Saviour meant that the apostles should make any alteration in that matter, and not baptize the infants, as had been usually done, it is a wonder he did not say so.’ Placing the stress of the matter in this, that the Scripture is wholly silent as to our Lord’s giving a direction to make any alteration in this point.

He speaks much after the same manner, and in the same case too, when he allows, that notwithstanding what he had said, baptism ‘ought to be regulated by the practice of John, and of Christ himself,—rather than by any preceding custom of the Jewish nation: if we had any good ground to believe that they did, in the case of infants, differ, or alter any thing from the usual way: but we have no kind of proof that they made any such alteration.’ Here again he argues from the Scriptures’ silence, and therefore my inference will stand good against him, that indeed infants might be baptized if we had any good ground to believe that Christ and his apostles baptized any: but we have no kind of proof that they baptized any; and if our Saviour meant that the apostles should have done it, it is a wonder he did not say so.

But certainly, as we had no power to baptize at all without his command, so neither have we power to baptize any but *such* as he commanded: and those you have already seen, sir, Mr. Wall himself allows to be the adult only, as far as the Scriptures can go to inform us of the matter.

Against all this there is a miserable cavil, very common in the mouths of pædobaptists, which one would think men of the most ordinary capacities could not persuade themselves to use: viz. they observe, that Christ has nowhere forbid them to baptize infants, and therefore they infer they ought not to neglect it. This is so very trifling, that I do not know whether you will excuse me for taking

<sup>a</sup> Introd. p. 15. [14.]

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. p. 18. [17.]



notice of it. However, it is of such weight with some people, and our author himself has recourse to it so frequently, that it is necessary just to touch on it.

The proposition is this: 'Christ has nowhere forbid us to baptize 'our children.' But, first, all that will follow from thence at best, is only that it is in itself, simply considered, lawful to sprinkle or dip children, when and how we please; but it can in no wise be inferred that we *ought* to do so: no, nor that it is lawful to do it as a religious ceremony, or a thing appointed by Christ: nor will it at all follow, that this may be boldly substituted in the place of what our Lord did ordain. Christ has not indeed forbid us to bathe ourselves every day, and therefore it is certainly lawful to do it: but if we do it as a part of divine worship, and impose it on others as such, we become inexcusably guilty of superstition, and the worst kind of tyranny.

Mr. Wall himself has noted, out of Epiphanius, that it is one of Marcion's errors to teach that such religious purification by baptism may lawfully be repeated. Many human inventions may doubtless be very lawfully practised as such, because they are not either directly or indirectly prohibited in Scripture; but if they are imposed as divine institutions, the reason ceases, and they are no longer lawful: for though they may not be particularly mentioned, yet Christ does expressly enough condemn them in that general censure of the Scribes and Pharisees, for *teaching as doctrines the commandments of men*. And whatever may be ranked under *the commandments of men*, and belong to that denomination, cannot plead the Scriptures' silence in their favour, but are here most directly and expressly condemned.

So that though we should allow it lawful, merely in compliance with the customs of a country, to sprinkle children for their health, suppose, or on account of any other civil ceremony, because as such it is nowhere forbidden; I see no inconvenience in it. But then this reason will not hold if they should urge it, as the pædobaptists do, as an ordinance of Christ; for the Scripture is not silent in this case, but on the contrary, explicitly against such presumptions, as ascribing inventions to the Divine will.

Tertullian, on another occasion, well exposes the weakness of this way of arguing. Some in his time pleaded for the lawfulness of wearing a military crown, which the Romans gave their soldiers who had distinguished themselves by some extraordinary action, and thought they might continue to wear it after their conversion to Christianity; and if any found fault, they presently recurred to our

author's subterfuge, that the Scriptures nowhere forbid them to do so. 'It is an easy matter,' says Tertullian, 'to demand where it is written we may not wear the crown? But then too, where is it written we may? For those who require their adversaries to produce Scripture authority, conclude by it that their own cause should be supported by the same. If it is lawful therefore to wear the crown, because the Scripture nowhere forbids it; it may with equal force be retorted, that it is therefore not lawful because the Scripture does nowhere command it. What then must be done in this case? Must both be allowed, because neither is forbidden? Or must both be rejected, because neither is commanded? You will say, perhaps, what is not prohibited is therefore allowed: no, it is forbidden by not being expressly allowed<sup>s</sup>.'

If Tertullian's reasoning here should not hold as to things in their own nature indifferent, he must however be blind indeed that does not see how strongly it holds in all religious matters, which it may be pretended we ought, or ought not to do. In short, all that can be made of their argument is, that as they have nothing for their practice in the Scriptures, so there is nothing against it; as much as to say, We have no reason to oppose the practice, and they have no reason to plead for it. But whether we have reason to oppose them, let all men judge; if they have no reason to urge for their practice, their cause is bad enough; for, as Mr. Locke somewhere says, 'he that believes without having any reason for believing, may be in love with his own fancies; but neither seeks truth as he ought, nor pays the obedience due to his Maker.'

It would be thought extravagant in any man to pretend, such a clod in a certain field is the selfsame piece of earth which about six thousand years ago was Adam's body, because the Scripture does not say the contrary. As wild as this appears to be, it is however as just as the paedobaptist's plea; and must be allowed so, for it is grounded on the same reason, viz. that the Scripture nowhere says the contrary.

2. In the next place, you may please to observe, that though in some cases the Scripture's silence may leave the thing indifferent to the freedom or opinion of every man, yet it is far from being so

<sup>s</sup> Lib. de Corona, cap. 2. p. 101. Et facile est statim exigere, ubi scriptum sit, ne coronemur? At enim ubi scriptum est, ut coronemur? Expostulantes enim Scripturæ Patrocinium in parte diversa, præjudicant suæ quoque Parti Scripturæ Patrocinium adesse debere. Nam si ideo dicetur coronari licere quia non prohibeat

Scriptura, æque retorquebitur, ideo coronari non licere, quia Scriptura non jubet. Quid faciet disciplina? Utrumque recipiet, quasi neutrum prohibitum sit? An utrumque rejiciet, quasi neutrum præceptum sit? Sed quod non prohibetur, ultro permissum est. Immo prohibetur quod non ultro est permissum.

always. Things in their own nature indifferent may be left so well enough; but it is not an indifferent matter whether we obey God and Christ or not, and perform divine service according to his will and appointment. And therefore the Scripture's silence cannot be pleaded here with any reason at all. They do not forbid us, in so many words expressly, to give the sacramental supper to a Turk; but who will therefore infer he may? Why does not our author baptize persons after they are dead, to wash them from all sins committed in their lifetime; since the Scripture does not expressly forbid him to baptize such; nor any where declare persons so baptized shall not be perfectly cleansed and forgiven?

Again; where does the Scripture tell us in terms the Roman is not the only true catholic church? that oral tradition may not entirely be depended on? that the doctrine of sacramental justification is a mischievous error? as the learned bishop of Salisbury nevertheless justly calls it; and argues, as I have hitherto done, in direct contradiction to our author's way, that 'since this is nowhere mentioned in all the large discourses that are in the New Testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it<sup>z</sup>.' Pilgrimages, and all kinds of penance, &c., stand upon the same bottom. But to give an instance something nearer to the matter in hand; we are nowhere forbid to baptize our cattle, bells, tables, &c., but yet our author, I hope, would never infer that they *may*, much less that they *ought* to be baptized; for to administer the sacraments to visibly unfit subjects, is no better than an impious profanation of them.

Now from all this, instead of a great deal more which might easily be added, it clearly appears, if our author argues well, and the Scripture's silence be a sufficient reason for a thing, that he ought in honour and conscience to return to Rome; that is the least he can do. Nay, all the silly trumpery of Rome, the ancient as well as the modern, may be brought into play again by this one single topic; which manifestly opens a door to all the inventions of every fanciful brain, which has but the luck to hit on such odd notions as the Scriptures do not expressly contradict.

I suppose, sir, you may have seen, when you were at Padua, the sermon which good St. Anthony is said to have preached to a congregation of fishes, in one of his flaming fits of devotion; and since the Scripture nowhere forbids to preach to fishes, to trees, to wild beasts, &c., but commands to *preach the Gospel to every creature*,

<sup>z</sup> Exposition of Article xi. p. 125.



which seems to have the like colour with that which the pædobaptists urge for their tenet, why should we laugh at St. Anthony's zeal? For, according to our author's rule, he was much in the right, and our author himself ought to follow his example.

I intended to have dismissed this matter in fewer words, but it is insensibly grown under my pen. However, of the two extremes, I had rather allow myself to be too *long*, than too *obscure*. I am,

Sir,

Yours, &c.

## LETTER VII.

THAT the Scripture does not leave infant-baptism so undetermined as some would pretend, is largely shewn from Matt. xxviii. 19—All laws equally oblige in all particulars mentioned in them—This applied to our present dispute—The commission necessarily obliges to teach all it intends should be baptized—Therefore infants cannot be included in that commission—The commission also requires that all of whom it speaks should be first taught, and afterwards baptized—The ridiculous objection of such as say, infants also are to be taught, answered—Some would evade the force, by confessing this commission relates peculiarly to the adult: which is directly giving up the argument—What the pædobaptists urge from the words *all nations*, answered—It is not said *all of all nations*—Illustrated by a parallel instance from Matt. iii. 5, 6—Mr. Dorrington censured—It is proved, the commission most directly excludes infants—What the pædobaptists urge concerning the Greek word *μαθητεύσατε*, answered—Dr. Hammond censured for so grossly contradicting himself in this point—Men of the greatest learning disown the criticism of the pædobaptists—A passage from the bishop of Sarum; another from Dr. Whitby—*Μαθητεύειν* is constantly used to signify nothing less than to teach, &c.—The sense of the word proved from its etymology—The primitive and all its derivatives include teaching, &c.—No room for an antiphrasis, which is now exploded by the best grammarians—The pretence from the termination, that words in *-εύω* are to be interpreted by *sum* in Latin, is groundless—Plutarch uses the word to signify *to teach*—Another instance from St. Ignatius; another from the same: another from the same—One from St. Clemens Alexandrinus; one from St. Justin Martyr—The meaning of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*—Another instance from St. Justin—The word *μαθητεύειν*, even in its supposed neuter acception, notwithstanding the contrary pretences, always includes *teaching*—Matt. xxvii. 57, considered—Instances wherein the word signifies *to teach*, &c., even when constructed with a dative case; from Plutarch; from Origen; from St. Irenæus, expounded by a passage of Socrates; and from Clemens Alexandrinus—The true sense of the word further illustrated by synonymous words—Instances of *παιδεύω*, from Plutarch; from Ælian; from Plato—Instances of *ἀκούω*, from Pindar; from Diogenes Laërtius; from Plutarch—An instance of *διακούω*, from Plutarch—A very remarkable instance of the sense of *μαθητεύειν*, from Clemens Alexandrinus—Another from the same—One from Origen—Besides, if what our ad-



versaries advance were right, it can be of no advantage to them, because the word in the commission is allowed to be transitive—Discipleship necessarily includes teaching—*Μαθητεύω* means *to teach successfully*; and therefore is indeed consequentially to make disciples.

---

I HOPE, sir, I may venture to say, that what was urged in my last amounts to little less than a demonstration, that it is the worst logic in the world to argue, as the pædobaptists do, from the supposed silence of the Scriptures; which I have shewn plainly enough is not only no argument for infant-baptism, but on the contrary, concludes as strongly against it as any reasonable man can desire an argument should do. And this is the first of those considerations, which I pretend do utterly ruin our author's design, even though he should prove (as we shall hereafter see he does not) that the Jews did use to baptize their proselytes together with their children, and that the Christians soon after the apostolic times did so too; for you will allow me, that arguments from Scripture are of far more force than both these.

But in the next place I add another consideration, of much greater weight still; namely, that the Scripture does not leave this matter so undetermined as the pædobaptists would fain persuade themselves, but that it directly disallows of infant-baptism, and admits of no other but that of adult persons. I once intended to have made out this, in an exact and particular examination of all those passages of Scripture which have or might have been pleaded on either side: but I find I am like to be tedious enough without it; and therefore I shall think it is sufficient to do it from Matt. xxviii. 19, which is indeed the main ground and foundation of the ordinance, and the sole authority and rule, even for the holy apostles themselves, in this matter. If I am pretty large on this, you will excuse me, because it is instead of all the rest.

To proceed then with plain and clear evidence. I desire you to consider, that if any law or commission, &c., does enjoin, and particularly mention two or more things to be done; the said law, &c., does equally oblige to the performance of each of those things, and render one as necessary and indispensable as the other, unless there be some particular exception to the contrary. Thus the judges, for instance, are empowered and obliged to try and to give judgment in such and such causes: if they only hear them, they do not discharge their duty, but are equally obliged to determine and give sentence according to law. For the authority which obliges to one, is equal in its obligation with respect to the other.

This notion was the ground of that dissatisfaction in the time of king Charles I. concerning the business of Rochelle<sup>a</sup>; for all people thought those forces had been sent to the assistance of the town, and therefore that they were equally obliged, both to go thither, and to assist the besieged: but when the matter unluckily miscarried, they began to think the commanders were excused from assisting the distressed by contrary private instructions. And what mightily confirms the supposition is, that, as Leti remarks<sup>b</sup>, ‘they might with very little danger have relieved the place;’ and without such instructions they would, as they were required, have acted with more vigour and prudence.

But, however the truth be, this serves to illustrate my general rule, which I suppose will not be disputed: and then this particular branch of it must be also allowed me, viz. that since the commission to baptize mentions teaching as well as baptizing, without making any distinction, or saying any thing of one, which is not said of the other; therefore this commission does equally oblige both to teach and to baptize. And upon this principle I will shew you, that the commission under consideration cannot comprehend infants. In order to which I observe, 1. That the words do necessarily oblige to teach all whom they intend should be baptized. And, 2. That this teaching must always as necessarily precede their being baptized. Both which articles do very plainly exclude infants, because they are not capable of being taught at all.

1. As to the first thing, that the institution does indispensably enjoin, that all who are to be baptized must likewise be taught; this is evident, if you observe, that the command, in both its parts, is equally and universally applied to all those subjects which are mentioned therein, and are denoted by that comprehensive phrase, *all nations*. For there is no manner of distinction or difference made between some and others of this aggregate. This will more certainly appear, if we resolve the proposition logically. The only subjects spoken of are *all nations*: the things said of these subjects are, that they must be taught, and that they must be baptized. Now both these being said of the same subjects, we may form the words into these two propositions, for they are virtually two, viz. *teach all nations*, and *baptize all nations*. The steps I take are easy

<sup>a</sup> [Rochelle, the stronghold of the French protestants, after a protracted and arduous siege, was taken by Lewis XIII. in 1637. So much interest was excited in this country in favour of the besieged, that besides other demonstrations noticed by the historians of the pe-

riod, one of the pamphlets of the day recommends itself to notice as being ‘printed in the year and month wherein ‘Rochelle was lost!’]

<sup>b</sup> Ceremonial, part iv. lib. 5. p. 411. Che potevano con poco raschio soccorrer la piazza.

and sure, according to the method in use among mathematicians, than which nothing can be more plain and conclusive; and therefore I may well enough call it a demonstration, that the very same persons, whoever they be, who are meant in the commission by *all nations*, and commanded to be baptized, are all equally commanded to be taught likewise. And so far are the words from intimating any thing to the contrary, and from distinguishing between some who are to be taught, and others who are not; that they are rather so ordered, as to render it scarce possible for any man even but to surmise that those two words *teach* and *baptize* do not both of them relate exactly to all the same persons, and to whatever is meant in the commission by *all nations*.

Let us take it for granted now, that those to whom the commission is given are bound to teach *all nations*, as well as to baptize *all nations*; and this will be the consequence of it, that infants cannot be included in this commission. For, if it requires the subjects spoken of should be taught as well as baptized, then they must be all capable of teaching as well as of baptism: for the Scriptures, doubtless, are not so unreasonable as to command us to do that to any subject, which it is not capable of receiving. This would not consist with the highest justice and goodness and wisdom, with which we believe all our Lord's institutions are given.

How then can the pædobaptists persuade themselves to fancy, contrary to the express words of the Scripture, that some only are to be taught, whilst others may be as well baptized without any instruction at all?

They tell us, the word here translated *teach* has another very different, and more proper sense; but how weak this pretence is, I shall discover by and by. In the mean time this objection tacitly allows that both words do relate precisely to the same subjects; which is no less than yielding up the dispute: and I desire no greater advantage; for I hope to prove in the sequel, beyond all contradiction, that the Greek word does necessarily and properly signify *to teach* or *instruct*, and never means to *make disciples*, but in that manner. I will take it for granted then here; and at present only reply against their teaching of some, and not others, that there is no ground for it in the words, the institution being universal in both its parts, *teaching* and *baptizing*: and as there is no exception nor difference of persons made, so we must allow of none; such a fancy being as strongly guarded against as can possibly be, by expressing the subjects of baptism but once; to make it necessary that both the words should relate only to the same individuals exactly.

All this makes it plain that infants cannot be comprehended, but are rather designedly excluded: for if infants might be baptized, then some might be baptized, who neither do, nor are obliged to believe in Christ, and whom we are not, nor cannot be bound to persuade and teach: which is directly contrary to the express words of the institution; for that, as is above demonstrated, commands to teach all whom it commands to baptize; and therefore either both are commanded to be done to infants, or neither. This short conclusion necessarily arises from the commission, that if it does not speak of and enjoin teaching infants, it does not enjoin baptizing them: for if the term *all nations* comprehends infants, then they must be taught too, which is absurd; and if it cannot comprehend infants, then they must not be baptized: one of these things is unavoidable. The inference I draw is, that they are not to be baptized; because I suppose no man will imagine the Scriptures require us to preach the Gospel to infants, unless he is arrived to the good St. Anthony's exalted pitch of religious phrensy, and can think we should preach to fishes, wild beasts, trees, &c.

2. But in the second place I am to shew that the commission requires all who are therein commanded to be baptized should be first taught and instructed in the principles of the Christian religion. If this can be made out, the pædobaptists are effectually cut off from all their pretences and evasions of any kind; for then undoubtedly, not infants, but the adult only, are to be baptized.

I have often enough repeated it already, and it is so plain that I think nobody can deny it, that what this commission says of any one person, it says equally of all; because it speaks only in general, of all, without difference or exception. From whence it follows, that the same things are to be done to all, and that too in the same order. Since then it leaves no room in the least for any distinctions, but speaks indifferently and universally of all, what it enjoins on one it equally enjoins on all; and there remains only one of these two extremes to be chosen; either that teaching must always, or that it must never, precede baptism.

The pædobaptists are equally averse from both these: but they must necessarily choose one; and either allow, that they ought always to teach persons before they baptize them; or else, that they may always, in all cases, baptize before they teach them. I know, they had rather say, that some are to be taught first, and others are to be baptized first. But that cannot be admitted, because the Scripture allows no ground for any such distinction, but speaks in the same manner of all in general: and if it makes it necessary that



teaching or baptism should be first administered to some, it makes it as necessary it should be so to all.

Which then of the two remaining extremes is to be adhered to, it will not be very difficult to determine. Nobody dares say, that none are to be taught before they are baptized: this would shock every rational inquirer, it is so gross and palpable an error, as might be shewn from the nature of the thing, and the order observed in the commission, &c. And Christ certainly intended to be understood that his ministers should teach the Jews and heathens, and all adult persons, before they were baptized; which can only be implied in the order of the words, where teaching is first mentioned. And accordingly St. Hierome, as he is cited and translated by Mr. Wall himself, says on these very words, 'They first teach all the nations; then when they are taught, they baptize them with water: for it cannot be that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul have before received the true faith.' The same sense is put upon the commission by others of the more ancient Fathers, as I shall have occasion to shew hereafter. But our author adds, 'St. Hierome here commenting on the commission given by our Saviour to the apostles, of carrying the Gospel to the nations that were heathens, explains the method they were to use; viz. first, to teach those nations the Christian religion, and then to baptize them; which all pædobaptists grant to be the method that ought ever to be used<sup>c</sup>.'

I need not insist then any longer on this, our antagonists readily allowing, that at least the adult, and all such as are capable of being taught, cannot be regularly baptized without it. And therefore, too, in the Catechism of the Church of England, we are told, that of persons to be baptized are required, 'repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God,' &c., making these the necessary conditions of regularly administering baptism: that is, as they mean, to the adult.

We see therefore, that the pædobaptists themselves will not pretend they must *never* teach any before they baptize them; but on the contrary, make it necessary, at least in some cases, to teach first: but if it must be so in some cases, then, as I have before demonstrated, it must be so in all.

Having reduced the matter to this dilemma, and withal it being necessarily and freely allowed me, that the last part cannot be true; it evidently follows that we are obliged to baptize only such as have

been first taught, and do, according to the tenor of the Scriptures, profess a true faith and repentance.

Though the foregoing reasoning is not long, it may be useful perhaps to contract it here, and give the whole force of it in a shorter compass, that the evidence and certainty of its parts may be more easily discerned.

Either all must be taught before baptism, or none, or some only. But there is no ground to say some only, because the commission makes no distinction between what is to be done to some, and not to others. Neither can it be said that none are to be taught first; for this shuts out even the adult, which is against the opinion of our antagonists. It can only remain then, as a necessary conclusion, that all in general are to be taught before they can be admitted to baptism. And, by another consequence as strong as the former, infants cannot be of that number, and must not be baptized before they are taught.

To evade the force of all this, it has been answered, and I must needs say ridiculously enough, that infants are to be taught likewise, viz. when they come to age, and are capable of it; so that though the commission does require all who are baptized to be taught also, yet that does not exclude infants.

But, in the first place, I have just now shewn, that all must be taught *before* they can be regularly baptized; and this unavoidably excludes infants.

2. Supposing the commission could allow of this comment, then it may run thus: ‘*Go teach all nations*, even infants too when they ‘are grown up,’ &c., i. e. when they cease to be infants. This shift can be of no service to them: for if the term *all nations* only means adult persons, and infants when grown up, the question will be at an end, and we are agreed. It is a pretty odd distinction indeed; but they shall have it, if they please; and we will allow that infants when they are grown up (that is, to speak in our own way, and as we think more properly, when they are come out of that ignorant state, and are no longer infants, but adult persons) may be baptized. And if this will reconcile us, let both parties, instead of disturbing each other, unite henceforward in a common opposition of those enemies to the sacraments of our most holy religion, who dare wholly cashier and reject the ordinance.

Some again, with as little judgment and consideration, endeavouring to avoid the force of what I say, do in reality give me all I plead for. They frankly confess this commission relates peculiarly to the adult; and therefore think it is no wonder it is expressed so

as to be applicable to them only. This is insinuated more than once by Mr. Wall himself<sup>d</sup>; which I admire at. Did not he see it is all the antipedobaptists desired? that instead of invalidating what they urge, it was granting them their argument? For we presently return, that if this commission relates to adult persons, as they confess, then it authorizes to baptize only such: from whence it is easy and natural to infer, that no other baptism is to be allowed of. If this commission does not enjoin infant-baptism, we challenge them to shew us any other that does; and it is with the highest reason we assert there is no commission or authority for it in Scripture.

But these are trilles. A more material objection is still behind; namely, that the term in the commission being *all nations*, infants, as being a part of the nations, must equally be included with the rest; and are therefore to be accounted as proper subjects of baptism as persons of a more advanced age. At first sight this seems to carry something plausible in it; but a little thought will presently discover how superficial it is.

For, in the largest extent of the phrase, as taken to signify every individual of each species, all unbelievers, and profane blasphemers, both among the Jews and heathens, are comprehended too: so likewise are all atheists, and the vilest debauchees: add to these, all superstitious, obstinate idolators: together with mere naturals, and raving madmen, &c., for these are all parts of the *nations* as truly as infants. But none of our adversaries will say, these might therefore all, or any of them, be baptized.

Besides, you may take notice, sir, that our Lord does not say the whole nation, or every person of every nation, or all of all nations, which would have made the case very different from what it is; but only indefinitely, *all nations*. Scarcely a youngster, who has begun his logic, but is acquainted with the distinction between *genera singularum*, and *singula generum*: and there is visibly a wide difference between *all nations*, as the holy penman expresses it, and *all of all nations*, as our antagonists would fain understand it. And, in short, the plain meaning of our Lord can be only this, that as before they had preached only to the Jews, now they should preach the same Gospel to all other nations, and baptize them; that is, such of them as were capable of baptism, and would receive it.

Thus, for example, in a parallel instance of the same nature, St. John is said to have baptized *all India, and all the region round about Jordan*<sup>e</sup>: and yet we find in the following verses, that he

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. page 378. 379. 382. 381. 383.]

<sup>e</sup> Matt. iii. 5. 6.



rebuked the Pharisees and Sadducees, and gave them to know, that such as brought not forth *fruits meet for repentance* could not be admitted. Besides, (which reaches exactly the case in hand,) I observed it is added, ver. 6, that they confess their sins: which makes it plain that infants were not baptized by him, for they could make no such confession; and yet of all he there baptized in general, it is said, namely of *Jerusalem, and all Judæa, &c.*, that *they were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their sins*. Which by the way is, I think, a pretty plain demonstration, that St. John, our Lord's forerunner, did not admit infants to his baptism.

Now from all this it is evident, both that *all Judæa, &c.*, in this place, and *all nations*, in the commission, can only mean such as were capable and willing to receive the faith, and did resolve to endeavour *to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they were called*. It is wholly upon the comprehensiveness of this phrase that our adversaries ground all their hopes to find infant-baptism instituted in this commission. This our author confesses, when he says, that 'it affords this argument for paedobaptism; infants are part of the nations, and so to be baptized by this commission<sup>f</sup>.' But I have utterly taken away this pretence, and proved there is no real ground from the commission to think infants ought to be baptized. And the best argument for it is so very precarious, that I cannot but wonder at Mr. Dorrington's preposterous attempt to make use of this text, to prove from it, that infants as well as others ought to be baptized.

But that author affects wonders; and his whole book is one, in which he undertakes to prove infant-baptism from Scripture; which is as much as to say, the Scripture positively asserts what it does not speak one word of. Mr. Wall has acted more modestly, and very ingenuously owns, all that can be found in the Scriptures is too obscure to build upon, and so wisely declines the combat with that weapon. And if the rector of Wittresham had better considered the matter, it is likely he would have laid by his design, rather than have exposed himself so much by the publication of this book.

What is said above concludes at least thus much, that there is nothing in the commission which can be tolerably urged to prove that infants are included in it. But this is not all: I have likewise

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. p. 378. [651.]

<sup>g</sup> [See 'A Vindication of the Christian Church, in the baptizing of Infants, drawn from the Holy Scriptures. By Theophilus Dorrington, Rector of Wittresham in Kent.' 8vo. London, 1701.—The portion of this work which called

forth these censures from Mr. Gale, is chapter third of part the second, page 126<sup>g</sup>, &c. 'Wherein is explained and improved, to the justifying the baptizing of infants, the text in Matthew xxviii. 19.']



been arguing, that the commission necessarily and directly excludes infants; and this I am chiefly concerned here to make good. What we urge to this purpose is principally from the word *teach*; for, as Mr. Wall propounds our argument, 'Infants are such a part of the nations as are not capable of being taught, and so not to be baptized<sup>h</sup>;' because the commission does as much command to teach, as to baptize all nations; and if there be any difference, rather more strongly; for it is to be noted, that the subject *all nations* is immediately joined with *teach*, so that there cannot possibly be any evasion. This must needs be a powerful argument to all men that duly consider it, and it highly concerns all pædobaptists to get clear of it as well as they can.

But the word *teach* which makes the difficulty, after a great deal of hammering, they<sup>i</sup> at length conclude, does not truly express the sense of the original; and therefore they fall foul on the translation, and tell us, the true sense in which it ought to be rendered is, *disciple* or *proselyte*, instead of *teach* all nations. Now, say they, though infants are not capable of being taught, yet they may be proselyted. But I think this criticism has nothing in it.

If indeed the Greek word does signify barely *to disciple*, by baptizing suppose, or any other way, without including *to teach*, all our argument from this place unavoidably falls to the ground. And that it does signify so, is very frequently asserted by the divines of the church of England, and among the rest, by Dr. Hammond<sup>k</sup>, from whom our author takes it, as he has done most of his best thoughts.

I name Dr. Hammond in particular, because there is something in his conduct upon this point which deserves especial notice; for though he is certainly a considerable man, yet his opinion will weigh but very little on one side or the other in this case, because he grossly contradicts himself, and by turns equally countenances and rejects both. When he is bent upon destroying all that may be thought to prejudice the cause of infant-baptism, then he says the word does not signify *to teach*,<sup>l</sup> but to receive into discipleship, by baptism as the ceremony, without supposing any preceding instruction: and yet notwithstanding he is so positive here, in his Paraphrase and Annotation he strenuously asserts the direct con-

<sup>h</sup> Part ii. p. 378. [651.]

<sup>i</sup> [Mr. Gale here uses the plural *they*: in explanation of which term it may be well to mention, that Mr. Dorrington, the publication of whose treatise on baptism preceded Dr. Wall's, gives the same inter-

pretation of the Greek word μαθητεύω, namely, not simply *to teach*, but *to make disciples*: see his work, part 2. chap. iii. sect. 3. p. 132\*, &c.]

<sup>k</sup> Six Queries, p. 196.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid.

trary, and thus paraphrases the words, ‘teach all nations the Christian doctrine, and persuade them to embrace it, and to live according to it.’ And in the note he has more to the same purpose. In his Dissertations on Episcopacy he runs the words thus: ‘Call to discipleship, or instruct all nations in the faith and discipline; certify all of the resurrection of Christ, and by preaching the Gospel in all parts, gather disciples; and those you have so gathered, baptize and teach<sup>m</sup>.’

So plainly does this learned man contradict himself: upon which this remark is obvious; that when the doctor’s mind was not immediately under the power of prejudices, (which were as strong in him sometimes as in other men,) and when he had no interest to serve, he could see and acknowledge the truth, which the dust his prejudices raised hindered him from seeing at other times.

But farther, this answer is utterly false; and is accordingly disowned by men of the greatest learning, as Cameron<sup>n</sup>, Grotius<sup>o</sup>, Rigaltius<sup>p</sup>, with others whom I shall mention hereafter. Add to these the right reverend and learned bishop of Sarum, who in his judicious Exposition of the Articles says thus: ‘By the first teaching or making of disciples, that must go before baptism, is to be meant the convincing the world that Jesus is the Christ, the true Messias, anointed of God with a fulness of grace, and of the Spirit without measure, and sent to be the Saviour and Redeemer of the world. And when any were brought to acknowledge this, then they were to baptize them, to initiate them to this religion, &c., and then they led them into the water, and with no other garments but what might cover nature, they at first laid them down in the water, as a man is laid in a grave, and then they said these words, *I baptize, or wash thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: then they raised them up again, and clean garments were put on them<sup>q</sup>,’ &c. In this account of the method the apostles and first Christians pursued, his lordship has given almost as exact a description of our practice to this day, as if he had designed to express it.

Dr. Whitby likewise, somewhat more largely, with his usual modesty and candour, corrects this mistake. ‘*Μαθητεύειν*,’ says he, ‘here is *to preach the Gospel to all nations*, and to engage them to

<sup>m</sup> Dissert. 3. cap. iv. § 1. Ad discipulatum vocare, vel disciplina et fide imbuere gentes omnes, resurrectionem Christi omnibus testatam facite, et evangelio per omnes oras enunciato discipulos congre-

gate, congregatos βαπτίζοντες et διδάσκοντες.

<sup>n</sup> In loc.

<sup>o</sup> In loc.

<sup>p</sup> In Cyprian. Epist. 64.

<sup>q</sup> Page 300. [on the 27th Article.]

‘believe it, in order to their profession of that faith by baptism’.<sup>r</sup>—This he goes on to confirm, and then adds, ‘I desire any one to tell me, how the apostles could μαθητεύειν, make a disciple of an heathen or unbelieving Jew, without being μαθηταί, or teachers of them; whether they were not sent to preach to those that could hear, and to teach them to whom they preached, that Jesus was the Christ, and only baptize them when they did believe this? This is so absolutely necessary in the nature of the thing, until a Christian church among the heathens or the Jews was founded, and so expressly said by Justin Martyr<sup>s</sup> to have been the practice in the first ages of the church, that to deny what is confirmed by such evidence of reason and church-history, would be to prejudice a cause, which in my poor judgment needs not this interpretation of the word μαθητεύειν; nor needs it to be asserted, that infants are made disciples, any more than that they are made believers by baptism’, &c.

I do not see how it is possible to make any reply to this, and therefore I might be excused from adding any thing more: but because the stress of our argument from the commission lies chiefly in this word, and our adversaries generally make it their main resource, I will the more studiously proceed to shew, beyond question; 1. From the sense of the Greek word; 2. From the authority of several versions; 3. From the opinions of the Fathers; and lastly, From the Scriptures themselves, and the practice of the apostles; that μαθητεύσατε does always, and particularly in the place under consideration, signify *to teach* or *instruct*, and to make disciples only by so doing.

1. I begin first with shewing, that μαθητεύειν is constantly used to signify nothing less than *to teach* and *instruct*. This seems to me so incontestably evident on all accounts, that I am really not a little amazed to find it contradicted by men so considerable for learning and good sense.

If we do but try all the methods which are used in finding out the true sense of a word, we can never fail of perceiving how certainly this is the sense of the word before us. And if any one can

<sup>r</sup> In loc.

<sup>s</sup> Apol. ii. p. 93. E. “Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύουσιν ἀληθῇ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνώνται, εὐχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν, &c. ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ’ ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδαρ ἔσσι, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀναγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. [Apol. i. sect. 61. p. 71. in edit. Benedictin.]

<sup>t</sup> [Mr. Gale does not complete the sen-

tence, which goes on thus; ‘but only that they are and ought to be admitted into the Christian church and kingdom of God, and into the new covenant by baptism, if they be children of believing parents.’ Dr. Whitby likewise immediately subjoins a dissertation on the foregoing note, to remove an impression that his words might possibly be construed into a disapproval of infant-baptism.]



make the experiment, and after examination deny it signifies *to teach*; he may as well, if he pleases, open his eyes, and turning to the sun when it shines out, deny there is any sun at all, or affirm it is midnight.

As to the origination of the word, if any thing may be inferred from thence; (and surely it must rather bear some agreement in signification with its primitive, than contradict it; it having always been thought one good way to know the sense of a word, to inquire into its etymology;) its origination, I say, leaves not the least room for our antagonists to surmise as they do, but concludes against them as strongly as any thing of this nature can do, and makes it necessary to understand it to signify *to teach, instruct, or the like*.

No man doubts but *μανθάνειν*, the theme, signifies properly *discere, docere, to learn, to teach or instruct*; and it may be observed, that all words derived from it do ever retain some marks of this signification; thus *μάθημα* a document, instruction, or that which is taught or learned; *μαθητὸς*, teachable, or apt to learn; *μαθητιᾶν*, I desire to learn. And so in its compounds, *ἀμαθής*, unlearned; *ἀρτιμαθής*, one that lately began to learn; *αὐτομαθής*, one that learned of himself, without the help of a master; *ὀλιγομαθής*, one that learned but little; and *πολυμαθής*, one that has learned much. *Ἀναμανθάνω* I learn again. *Καταμανθάνω* I learn thoroughly or, exactly. *Συμμανθάνειν*, to learn together; from whence *συμμαθητὴς*, a school-fellow, or fellow-learner. And so in like manner of all the rest.

Since then the primitive signifies *to learn, &c.*, and all its derivatives and compounds retain the like sense; why must only *μαθητὴς* and *μαθητεύω* be excepted? And where is their ingenuity, who so irregularly, and contrary to the analogy of the Greek tongue, arbitrarily pretend that these words have no relation to teaching, &c., only because this fancy serves their purpose something better? whereas an impartial judge would, from this observation alone, conclude *μαθητεύειν* must needs signify *to teach, or to be taught, or to cause to be taught, or some such thing*, which should include teaching.

I suppose nobody will any more recur to the antiquated invention which some grammarians have long been proud of; I mean the antiphrasis, which is now exploded by the best and most learned philologists, as a mere cover for the ignorance of those who use it. I need not refer you to the Spanish Minerva; for to be sure you remember well enough the sixteenth chapter of the fourth book, where Sanctius solidly exposes the mistake those grammarians com-



mitted, who, when they knew no better, imagined words were sometimes used in a contrary sense to the primitive from whence they were derived. *Lucus* in Latin is a common instance in every body's mouth; but the more accurate and judicious now no longer say it is derived 'a *lucendo*, quia minime luceat;' but rather, because of the great and almost continual illuminations in the groves, occasioned by sacrifices, &c., as say Vossius<sup>u</sup> and Perizonius<sup>v</sup>, to name no more. And if this antiphrasis be, as Vossius expresses it, but 'a silly whim of the grammarians<sup>w</sup>,' who are oftentimes none of the ablest critics, then *μαθητής* and *μαθητεύω*, as they are derived from *μανθάνειν*, to learn, &c., must likewise bear some congruity in their signification, and not be applicable to such as are not capable of learning or being taught.

But some argue from the termination, and pretend, that verbs in -εύω are to be interpreted by *sum* in Latin; and so *μαθητής* signifying a disciple only, *μαθητεύω* might be rendered *sum discipulus*. It is easy to see how trifling this is; and that were it true, it could be of no use to our adversaries; for *μαθητής* we assert means such a disciple only as is taught; and then *μαθητεύειν* will signify, according to their own way, to be such disciples. But besides, the criticism is utterly false, as might be made appear from innumerable examples: thus *κελεύω* signifies *jubeo*, to command, as well as *κέλω*, from whence it is formed; and so *βουλεύω*, to counsel, &c., from *βούλω*. The like may be observed of *ρέω*, from whence *ρέω* forms some of its tenses, so perfectly synonymous are the two words; as are also *σέω*, *σῶ*, and *σεύω*; *χέω* and *χεύω*; *πλέω*, *πλεύω*; *πνέω*, *πνεύω*; and this may be seen too in *βασιλεύω*, *ἀγορεύω*, *ἡγεμονεύω*, *φονεύω*, *θεραπεύω*, *ἀληθεύω*, *στρατεύω*, *χορεύω*, *θρησκευώ*, *ἐποπτεύω*, *προφητεύω*, *μαντεύω*, and *παιδεύω*, an instance in the very case, beside multitudes which I pass by, none of which can admit of the sense pretended.

Upon all this, I think, I may safely conclude, according to the analogy of derivations in the Greek tongue, as well as in all other languages, that as *disciple* in English is made of the Latin *discipulus*, which comes from *discere*, to learn; and as *διδάσκαλος*, a tutor, teacher, master, from *διδάσκειν*, to teach, because such a master *διδάσκει*, does teach; but *κύριος*, a master, or governor, from *κῦρος* full power and authority, because masters and governors are supposed *κῦρος ἔχειν*, to have such power: so *μαθητής ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔμαθον* comes from *μανθάνειν*, to learn or teach, because *μαθηταί*, or disciples, learn or are taught: and hence *μαθητεύω* is the proper word to signify the action

<sup>u</sup> Partit. Orator. p. 339.

<sup>v</sup> In Sanctii Minerva, p. 931.

<sup>w</sup> Etymolog. ad vocem *Lucus*. Inane grammaticorum commentum, &c.

of teaching, whereby persons are to be made such disciples, or if you please of *discipling* or *making disciples by teaching*. But let this suffice concerning the origination of the word, and the assistance it yields to find out the true sense of it.

What I am going to add in the next place will perhaps be thought less liable to exception than arguing upon etymologies, which with some men is but trifling: I will therefore prove what I have affirmed, by the use of the word in Greek authors, which must be allowed to carry weight in it.

Of all the passages wherein I have observed it to occur, I do not know nor believe there is one, but does necessarily include and signify *teaching*, or at least may admit it: and nothing any where gives reasonable ground so much as to surmise the contrary; so far is it from being as our adversaries pretend: and if they should be able to produce one instance where, by some strange chance, or a violent catachresis, it does signify *to disciple*, and exclude teaching, which I am persuaded they will never be able to do, that will be far short of a sufficient reason to say the word signifies so elsewhere; much less that it is the proper signification in which it is always or commonly used: and yet our adversaries, some of them at least, are very fond of the thought, and would fain persuade *us* to believe it too.

But the evidence on our side, that the Greek word includes teaching, &c. is plain from these following instances.

Plutarch, in the account he gives of the life of Isocrates, says, that when he taught rhetoric at Athens, Hyperides, Isæus, and Demosthenes came to him, and made him this offer; that since they could not give him a thousand drachms, his usual fee, they would not expect to be taught the whole art, but would pay him two hundred drachms, for a fifth part of it only. By the way observe, their sole aim was *to learn* or *be taught*. To their proposal Isocrates returns this answer<sup>x</sup>; ‘We do not use, Demosthenes, to divide our art; but as good fish are sold entire, so if you have a mind to learn, or *to be taught* (μαθητεύειν), I will instruct you in the whole art.’ This instance can need no improvement; for you have nothing to do but to read the passage, in order to see that all they apply to Isocrates for was his instruction; and that therefore in his answer he speaks of nothing else.

And that this is the sense of the word in the language of the

<sup>x</sup> Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1539. Τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι ὡς οὐ τεμαχίζομεν, ὦ Δημοσθενες, τὴν πραγματείαν· ὥσπερ δὲ τοὺς

καλοὺς ἰχθῦς ὅλους πωλοῦμεν, οὕτω καὶ γὰρ σοι, εἰ βούλοιο μαθητεύειν, ὁλόκληρον ἀποδώσομαι τὴν τέχνην.

primitive church, methinks should be exceeding plain to all who are not utter strangers to those useful pieces of antiquity which still remain; for they furnish us with instances in abundance, and very clear to the purpose. Thus the holy martyr St. Ignatius, giving some instructions to the Ephesians, with his usual profound humility and meekness, adds, 'Not that I take upon me to direct you, as if I were any body: for though I am bound for his name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus; nay, I am as it were but now beginning (*μαθητεύεσθαι*) to learn, or to be instructed; and I speak to you as fellow-disciples with me,' &c. If there could have been otherwise any doubt what the word might signify here, *συνδιδασκαλίταις* immediately following in the last sentence, would have made it certain; for to say he speaks to them as fellow-learners, because he did but then begin *μαθητεύεσθαι*, must render it yet more necessary to understand the word there to mean *to learn*, or be *taught* or *instructed*, &c.

Besides, he uses the same word again exactly thus a little after, where he directs the Ephesian Christians how to behave themselves even towards unbelievers and strangers to the faith; and advises them to pray for all men: for, says he, 'there is some hope they may repent, and obtain the mercy of God: let them be instructed (*μαθητευθῆναι*) by your good works. When they are angry, be you kind and forgiving<sup>z</sup>,' &c. And again, in that admirable Epistle to the Romans, so worthy of a Christian bishop, wherein he expresses an ardent and impatient desire to suffer martyrdom for Christ; among other things he most earnestly entreats them not to deprive him, through their mistimed kindnesses, of that glorious crown, by using their interest to prevent the death he was then going to suffer by wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome. More, says the illustrious Saint, you cannot do for me, than to suffer me to be sacrificed to God. And a little after: 'Ye have never envied [me in] any thing; ye have taught others; I would therefore that those things also should be confirmed by your practice, which you have prescribed in teaching (*μαθητεύοντες*): only pray for me that I may be so strengthened within

<sup>y</sup> Epist. ad Ephes. cap. 3. Οὐ διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν, ὡς ὢν τι· εἰ γὰρ καὶ δέδεμαι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι [αὐτοῦ], οὐκ ἀπῆρτισμαι ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· νῦν γὰρ ἄρχῃν ἔχω τοῦ μαθητεύεσθαι, καὶ προσλαλῶ ὑμῖν ὡς συνδιδασκαλίταις μου, &c. [The word *συνδιδασκαλίταις* does not occur in either of Cotelerius' editions, 1698 or 1724, from which Mr. Gale professes to quote: but

instead we read *ἑταίροις*, *fellow-servants*.]

<sup>z</sup> Epist. ad Ephes. cap. 10. Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε· ἔστι γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑλπίς μετανοίας, ἵνα Θεοῦ τύχωσι.—ἐπιστρέψατε οὖν αὐτοὺς [καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ὑμῖν] μαθητευθῆναι πρὸς τὰς ὁργὰς αὐτῶν ὑμεῖς πρεῖς, &c.



‘and without, as not only to be called a Christian, but also to be ‘found one<sup>a</sup>.’

These instances, without adding any more, might very well suffice to shew that *μαθητεύειν* signifies *to teach*, &c. But to convince you that this is not only a casual, but the constant sense of the word, I must take the liberty to add several instances more.

Clemens Alexandrinus discoursing of the use of philosophy in theological studies, against such as would have the Greek learning altogether useless; after he has said a great deal to that purpose, he observes that even the philosophy they were such enemies to borrowed many things from the Scriptures; and adds, that ‘the ‘things so borrowed in part are true, and are grounded sometimes ‘upon bare conjectures, and sometimes on necessary reasons. ‘If ‘they do learn (*μαθητευθέντες*),’ that is, borrow, ‘something from ‘the Hebrew philosophy, let them acknowledge it<sup>b</sup>.’

Again, shewing how philosophy tends to bring men to the knowledge of the true religion, by engaging all impartial inquirers ‘to converse not only with the Greeks, but with the barbarians ‘too,’ (as the Jews and Christians were then called,) ‘and by these ‘common ways of improving their knowledge they are brought to ‘the faith; and then having laid the foundation of the truth, they ‘are better enabled to go on in the search after it. And hence it is ‘that being taught (*μαθητευσάμενοι*) or instructed in the faith, they ‘approve of it; and by pursuing after knowledge, they vigorously ‘pursue salvation<sup>c</sup>.’ It is plainly impossible in these instances to put any other sense on the word in dispute than what I contend for.

Another passage of this author I cannot omit, it being if possible more plain and cogent than the former: ‘Those men,’ says he, ‘that are transformed into angels, are first instructed (*μαθητεύονται*) ‘by them a thousand years, and so raised to perfection: and then ‘the teachers were translated to archangels; and the learners in ‘their stead instructed (*μαθητεύουσιν*) or taught those who were to be ‘changed from men to angels.’<sup>d</sup> Here *μαθητεύειν* is most apparently

<sup>a</sup> Epist. ad Romanos, cap. 3. Οὐδέποτε ἐβασκάνατε [ἐν] οὐδενί· ἅλλους ἐδιδάξατε· ἐγὼ δὲ θέλω, ἵνα καὶ κείνα βέβαια ᾖ, ἡ μαθητεύοντες ἐντέλλεσθε· μόνον δύναμιν αἰτεῖσθέ μοι ἔσωθεν τε καὶ ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ θέλω, &c.

[Cotelerius has not the words enclosed within brackets, and instead of *πραεῖς* reads *ταπεινόφρονες*. The clauses also are irregularly and incorrectly mixed up here.]

<sup>b</sup> Stromat. lib. i. p. 320. Ἐκ μέρους τοίνυν ἃ κεκλήφασιν, ἀληθῆ μὲν· στοχα-

στικῶς δὲ καὶ ταῖς τῶν λόγων ἀνάγκαις ἴσασι. μαθητευθέντες οὖν καταληπτικῶς ἐπιγινώσκονται.

<sup>c</sup> Stromat. lib. vi. p. 691. Ἐπειτα οὐχ Ἕλλησι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ βαρβάροις διμήλῃσαντες, ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐκ συνασκήσεως κοινῆς εἰς σύνεσιν ἰδίαν ἄγονται· παραδείξάμενοι δὲ τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς ἀληθείας δύναμιν προσλαμβάνουσι προεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ζήτησιν· κἀνθένδε ἀγαπῶσι μὲν μαθητευσάμενοι, γνώσεως δὲ ὀριγινώμενοι σπεύδουσιν εἰς σωτηρίαν.

<sup>d</sup> Clem. Alexandr. Eclog. p. 809. a. Οἱ



interpreted by St. Clement himself to mean διδάσκειν as it relates to the angels, and μαρθάνειν as it relates to the persons that were taught ; which renders the instance perfectly unexceptionable.

To the same effect Justin Martyr too uses this word in his Apology to the Roman senate : ‘ If we were to kill one another, we ‘ should be the causes, as far as in us lay, that no more persons ‘ should be brought into the world, and taught (μαθητευθῆναι) or instructed in the Christian religion, and of putting an end to human ‘ kind<sup>e</sup>.’ And again, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, he tells him, that as God, for the sake of those seventy thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, forbore to pour out his anger upon the whole body ; ‘ So now in like manner,’ says St. Justin, ‘ God has ‘ not, or does not pour down his judgments, as knowing that some ‘ every day are taught to believe (μαθητευομένων) in the name of his ‘ Christ, and do forsake their erroneous ways<sup>f</sup>.’

It is a difficulty to translate the word here by any one in English, which will sufficiently express the sense of the original. This passage may be thought therefore to make rather against me than for me, especially if it should be asserted that the phrase μαθητεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ here, is the same in sense with βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. For to this purpose our antagonists talk, when they pretend μαθητεύειν in the commission is explained by the following words, and means by *baptizing* them, &c. But I know, sir, you are not liable to be imposed on by such fancies : for *to proselyte* to Christ or *to disciple* to Christ, though it be not the meaning of the word, may indeed be good sense enough ; but ‘ to proselyte into ‘ the name of Christ,’ is a phrase I believe never used : besides, no man will ever be able to find an instance where μαθητεύειν is put for and signifies βαπτίζειν.

But if the word be here used in the sense our antagonists assert, it should be rendered *discipled in the name of Christ* : and this, though a very odd, obscure sort of phrase, may be admitted, if it be understood to include *teaching*, and means *to disciple only by that* ; which will not be allowed : and yet *to disciple* in the name of Christ, without *teaching*, is nonsense, and can have no meaning at all ; for εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, *in the name*, intends *into the belief*, as Dr. Whitby

γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀγγέλους μεταστάντες χίλια ἔτη μαθητεύονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων, εἰς τελειότητα ἀποκαθιστάμενοι. εἶτα, οἱ μὲν διδάξαντες μετατίθενται εἰς ἀρχαγγελικὴν ἐξουσίαν· οἱ μαθόντες δὲ, τοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων αὐθις μεθισταμένους εἰς ἀγγέλους μαθητεύουσιν.

<sup>e</sup> Apolog. I. aut melius 2. p. 43. Εἰ οὖν πάντες ἑαυτοὺς φονεύσομεν, τοῦ καὶ

(lege μὴ) γεννηθῆναι τινὰ, καὶ μαθητευθῆναι εἰς τὰ θεία διδάγματα, ἢ καὶ μὴ εἶναι τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος, ὅσον ἐφ’ ἡμῖν, αἴτιοι ἐσόμεθα.

<sup>f</sup> P. 258. Τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, καὶ νῦν οὐδέπω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπήνεγκεν ἢ ἐπάγει, γινώσκων ἔτι καθ’ ἡμέραν τίνας μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπολείποντας τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης.

paraphrases Matth. xxviii. 19, and the most learned interpreters generally agree. And to be baptized in the name of Christ, is explained Rom. vi. 3. *by being baptized into Christ, and into his death*; and Gal iii. 27. *by putting on Christ*: all which must needs imply a profession of faith in Christ, and his death, into which they were baptized, as all the ancients understood it. Upon which account, baptism was called in the Greek church *σφραγὶς τῆς πίστεως*; and in the Latin church *sigillum fidei*, ‘the seal of faith.’

The substance of all this Mr. Wall himself likewise allows, when he insinuates that some among us who baptize only in the name of the Lord Jesus are probably Socinians; and ‘it is not for the use ‘of those,’ says he, ‘that have a mind to obliterate the belief of the ‘Trinity, to baptize their proselytes into the faith and name of it<sup>b</sup>.’ From which words it seems plain enough, that Mr. Wall by *εἰς τὸ δόγμα* understands *into the faith*; now, to initiate or disciple into or to the faith of Christ such as at the same time either do not or cannot know any thing of Christ, is an absurdity of the first rank.

It follows then, that the true sense of the word is no other than what I have given it: and if you will still have it rendered *discipled* to the name of Christ, that can however only mean in better English, *instructed in* and *brought over to* the faith of Christ; which is the sense I contend for. Besides, it may be further observed, that St. Justin is here speaking particularly of adult persons, who of Jews became Christians; which must be by believing in Christ, and ‘for-saking their errors,’ as he expresses it. And of the same persons again, a little after, he says, ‘They received the gifts of the Spirit as ‘every one was worthy, being enlightened by the name of Christ.’

If *φωτισόμενος* is here pretended to mean *baptized*, as Mr. Wall says it sometimes signified in the more distant centuries of the church, but I think not so early as St. Justin’s time; it will be thereby yet plainer, that *μαθητεύειν* a little before could not intend the same, but something else, viz. *to instruct*, upon which this baptism followed; the passage would otherwise be a gross tautology.

But if that word only denotes the enlightening of the mind, which seems most likely; it will still argue, that *μαθητεύειν* which precedes it, must signify to instruct, because the mind cannot be enlightened but by instruction. And if we only observe, that the persons spoken of are, as I said, adult, such as, it is granted on all hands, cannot become Christians without faith in Christ, which must come by hearing; this consideration alone is enough to determine, that the sense of the word in this place is as I have rendered

<sup>b</sup> Part ii. p. 222. [539.]

it; because it is applied to such as undoubtedly were actually instructed, and prevailed on to believe, and could not be initiated, *discipled*, or what you will please to call it, without such instruction. This I suppose is now sufficiently plain, and therefore I proceed to another instance from the same Father.

A few lines after, he tells his antagonist, that the Jews honour God and his Christ with their lips only; 'but we,' says he, 'having been instructed (*μεμαθητευμένοι*) or taught in all truth, honour them in our actions and knowledge, and in our whole minds, even unto death<sup>i</sup>.' *Μεμαθητευμένοι* is so strictly connected to *ἀληθείας* in this passage, that translate it into English by what word you please, it must of necessity imply *learning*, *teaching*, or the like; for no one can be *discipled*, &c. *to or by the truth* any other way.

But I need not repeat instances of this kind; for the more learned and judicious will allow, that when the word is used 'transitively,' as the grammarians speak, it does always signify as I contend: but when it is used in a neuter or intransitive sense, as it is often believed to be, they think it does not signify *to teach*, &c. I do not indeed remember that Mr. Wall any where makes this distinction; though I know some of the pædobaptists do: but he chooses to assert, with a dogmatical air, as if it was one of the plainest things in the world, that the word 'signifies much like what we say in English *to enter any one's name*, as a scholar, disciple, or proselyte<sup>k</sup>, &c., and this he never goes about to prove, or give the least reason for, but only shews how that interpretation of the word makes for his purpose; as if that was reason enough, and all men were obliged to submit to his determination.

But it will appear that he is altogether mistaken in this criticism, by shewing that even this artful distinction of some men which was just now mentioned, can be of no use; because the word, even in this neuter signification, does always mean and include *teaching*.

At present I remember but one passage which is cited on this occasion by those of the contrary opinion, and that is Matt. xxvii. 57, where it is said of Joseph of Arimathæa, *ἐμαθήτευσεν*, or as Beza's copy at Cambridge reads it, *ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ*, which our translation renders, *was Jesus' disciple*. This is supposed to be a plain instance that the word signifies simply *to be a disciple*; and therefore Constantine<sup>l</sup> cites only this place to confirm the neuter signification he puts upon the word, in opposition to *teach*; the transitive sense he had before mentioned.

<sup>i</sup> Dialog. cum Tryphon. p. 258. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, καὶ ἐν ἔργοις, καὶ γνώσει, καὶ καρδίᾳ, μέχρι θανάτου οἱ ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἀληθείας με-

μαθητευμένοι, τιμῶμεν.

<sup>k</sup> Part ii. p. 378. [651.]

<sup>l</sup> In Lexic. ad voc.



To this I answer: it is plainly a mistake to suppose the word is ever used as a neuter, or intransitively. Its being frequently construed with a dative case perhaps might occasion the mistake; for I observe Stephens<sup>m</sup>, Busby<sup>n</sup>, &c., note, that when it is joined with a dative, it signifies *to be a disciple*; but of all the instances of this construction I do not know one which will sufficiently confirm this supposition.

As for that produced by Constantine, from Matt. xxvii. 57, it is very short of the point: for why may not it as well be rendered, *had been instructed, taught, &c., by Christ?* or, *was brought over to Jesus*, as well as *was Jesus' disciple?* For this will express the sense of the place, as well at least as the vulgar translation; and with this advantage too, that the words I use are much more agreeable to the origination and primary sense of the Greek word, which ought to be considered. Besides, it is plain that Joseph, who was a Jew, could not become a disciple of Christ but by being taught and convinced that he was the true Messiah who was to come: and the very import and design of the words is manifestly to signify that Joseph did believe in Jesus; and therefore I cannot see any reason to suppose the word has a new sense here, when that which it is so generally used in is so proper.

To make it yet clearer what the word means in this construction, I will present you with several other instances, which I believe will oblige you to understand it in my sense.

Plutarch in the life of Antiphon the orator, says, 'he was taught' (*μαθητεύσας*) by his father, who professed oratory<sup>o</sup>; &c. It is observable, that Plutarch has himself explained the force of the word here, by these words which immediately follow: 'and having learned the art of pleading, he gave himself to the public.' And in the life of Isocrates he tells us, 'Theopompus of Scio, Ephorus of Cuma, Aselepiades the writer of tragedies, and Theodectes of Phaselis, were all educated (*ἐμαθήτηνσε*) or taught or instructed by, or brought up under him<sup>q</sup>.'

Again, he says of Æschines, that 'according to some he had never been taught (*μαθητεῦσαι*) by any master, but by writing in the courts became acquainted with the forms and manner of proceeding<sup>q</sup>.'

<sup>m</sup> Thesaur. Græc. ad voc.

<sup>n</sup> Gram. Græc. p. 162.

<sup>o</sup> Vit. decem Rhetor. [cap. i.] p. 1530. *Μαθητεύσας δὲ τῷ Πατρὶ (ὣν γὰρ σοφιστὴς, &c.,) καὶ δύναμιν λόγων κησόμενος, &c., ὤρμησε μὲν πολιτεύεσθαι.*

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. p. 1539. [cap. iv.] 'Ἐμαθήτηνσε

δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ Χίος, καὶ Ἐφόρος ὁ Κυμαῖος, καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ τὰ τραγῳδοῦμενα συγγράψας, καὶ Θεοδέκτης ὁ Φασικίτης, &c.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. p. 1545. [cap. vi.] *Οἱ δὲ εἶπον μὴδὲ μαθητεῦσαι τισὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ὑπογραμματείας ἀρθῆναι, ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις τότε διάγοντα.*



In these and all other such like passages, the word is manifestly used to signify *to be educated or instructed by* such and such masters : or as Plutarch expresses the same thing in another place, speaking of Æschines, ‘he learned to read of his father.’ So that if *σὺν* is omitted in the other places by an ellipsis, (as it is very usual,) the full construction will be just the same with this. Or if this preposition should not be inserted, Origen, who was not only a great philosopher and divine, but a great master of language too, plainly shews us, that these forms are certainly elliptical, and that the dative case is not governed by the verb, but a preposition, sometimes expressed, but commonly indeed to be understood.

The passage from whence I gather this is a good instance against Stephens, Constantine, &c., that the Greek word in dispute, even in this construction, has no other sense than that which I give it. Origen’s words are these, in answer to a question put by himself, namely, when the Jews, who believed in Christ, learned of the Father ; because the Lord had said, John vi. 45, *Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me* : Origen answers as a third person, but yet agreeably enough to what was known to be his own opinion, ‘The words must not be understood as though any one had seen the Father, for only he who is with the Father has seen him ; but to import, that the souls of some, before they came into the body and were born into the world, (μεμαθητευμένοι παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ,) were taught by the Father, and heard him,’ &c., in that state of their preexistence.

Here Origen uses μαθητεύειν for the same thing which in the text is expressed by μαρθάνειν ; which puts it out of all doubt that the sense is as I have translated it : and it cannot be obscure, because he is speaking of such as were prepared before their birth, by hearing the Father. Ferrarius therefore, without any difficulty, renders it ‘edoctæ apud Patrem,’ exactly in the sense I maintain.

Therefore by Origen’s supplying the construction by παρὰ, it appears that the phrase would have been defective without it, and that it must have been understood : or else ὑπὸ, which Irenæus has used to express the same sense. For example, speaking of St. Polycarp, he says, ‘he was not only instructed (μαθητευθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων) by the apostles and acquainted with many of those who had seen the Lord ; but was also constituted by the apostles bishop of the church of Smyrna in Asia.’ Though ὑπὸ be here joined with

q Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1544. [cap. vi.]  
Καὶ ἐπὶ παῖς ὧν ἐδίδασκε γράμματα σὺν τῷ πατρὶ.

r Comment. in Johan. p. 293.

s Apud Euseb. lib. iv. cap. 14. Πολύ-

καρπος δὲ οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς, καὶ συνναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος.

the genitive, it does not alter the phrase; for it is used promiscuously with a genitive or dative, without any difference in the sense; just as Origen, in the place above cited, and in the following words, shews us *παρὰ* is likewise. Thus Socrates Scholasticus, speaking of Eunomius the heretic, has this remarkable passage; ‘that being ‘*Λῆτιος*’ secretary, he was taught or led by him into (*ὑπ’ αὐτῷ παιδεύθεις*) the heresy<sup>t</sup>,’ which he afterwards gave name to. This passage is the more observable, because it serves to shew how *μαθητευθεις* is to be understood in St. Irenæus: for it is plain the sense in both places is the same; and therefore *παιδεύθεις*, which every body knows signifies *instructed, taught*, or the like, strongly confirms my interpretation of *μαθητευθεις* in the other place. And besides, it is there capable of no other sense; and the *Glossarium Latino-Græcum* annexed to Dr. Grabe’s edition of St. Irenæus renders the word by *edoctus, taught, instructed*, &c. C. Nepos expresses this sense by *eruditus*, when, speaking of Alcibiades, he says, ‘he was ‘taught by Socrates<sup>u</sup>:’ and so in other places.

We have another instance much of the same nature with that of Socrates, in Clemens Alexandrinus, which is parallel to what was cited from Origen, and may therefore serve to expound it. ‘For we ‘are taught of God, who are taught of the Son of God wisdom which ‘is truly divine<sup>x</sup>.’ What Origen expressed by *μαθητευόμενοι παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ*, St. Clement here expresses by *παιδευόμενοι παρὰ τῷ Ὑψί τῷ Θεοῦ*, for both speak of being taught of God.

And since I have begun, I will further illustrate the sense of the word under consideration by more examples of other words, which are synonymous to it, and used exactly to express the same thing.

Plutarch, speaking of Lysias, says, ‘he was taught (*παιδευόμενος*) ‘or studied under Tisias and Nicias of Syracuse<sup>y</sup>.’ Here he uses *παιδεύω* directly in the same sense, as in the instances above cited you may see he at other times uses *μαθητεύω*. So Ælian says of Persæus, ‘*Ἀντίγονον ἐπαίδευσε*, ‘he taught Antigonus.’ And again, a little after, ‘Lysis, a disciple of Pythagoras, instructed Epaminondas<sup>z</sup>.’

Plato, in one of his dialogues, makes Socrates say, Carry your sons with you; for in hopes of gaining them, they will be the more easily persuaded to teach us<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>t</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 35. fin. *Εὐνόμιος ταχυγράφος ὡν ἐκείνου, καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῷ παιδευθεὶς τὴν αἵρετικὴν λέξιν.*

<sup>u</sup> Vit. Alcibiad. p. 74.

<sup>x</sup> Stromat. lib. i. p. 318. *Θεοδιδασκται γὰρ ἡμεῖς, ἰερά ὄντως γράμματα παρὰ τῷ Ὑψί τοῦ Θεοῦ παιδευόμενοι.*

<sup>y</sup> De Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1536. [cap.

3.] *Παιδευόμενος παρὰ Τισίᾳ καὶ Νικίᾳ τοῖς Συρακουσίοις.*

<sup>z</sup> Ælian. Var. Histor. lib. iii. cap. 17. *Λύσις δὲ ὁ γινώριμος τοῦ Πυθαγόρου, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἐπαμεινώνδαν ἐξεπαίδευσε.*

<sup>a</sup> Euthydem. p. 190, D. *Ἵσως δὲ δέλεαρ ἔχρημεν αὐτοῖς τοὺς σοῦς νείεις· ἐφίεμενοι γὰρ ἐκείνων οἶδ’ ὅτι καὶ ἡμᾶς παιδεύσουσιν.*

In all these places *παιδεύειν* is used just as *μαθητεύειν* is in others, which I have mentioned before. From whence it is but reasonable to infer, that both these words, in these and such like cases, signify one and the same thing, namely, *to instruct*, or *teach*, or the like.

Another synonymous word, by which the sense of *μαθητεύω* may be illustrated, is *ἀκούω*, which is frequently enough used for *to learn* in the New Testament, as well as among profane writers. Pindar has a passage very pertinent to this effect, though the word is metaphorically applied in it: 'For Salamis can produce as brave soldiers,' says the poet, 'as any in the world; Hector learned (*ἄκουσεν*) the 'truth of this from Ajax before the walls of Troy<sup>b</sup>.' The ancient scholiast interprets *ἄκουσεν* by *μανθάνειν* in this place: and it is very plain the metaphor is taken from the schools, where pupils hear and are taught by tutors appointed to that purpose. And this word is often used to express this sense.

Diogenes Laertius says of Anaximenes, that 'he was educated or 'taught by (*ἤκουσεν*) Anaximander: others say, he studied under ' (*ἀκούσαι*) Parmenides<sup>c</sup>.' Of Socrates, in his Life, he says, that 'when according to some (*ἀκούσας*) he had been instructed by, or 'studied under Anaxagoras, and also by Damon, as Alexander in his 'Treatise of Succession affirms; after his condemnation, he heard ' (*διδύκουσεν*) or studied under Archelaus the Naturalist<sup>d</sup>.' And again, of Xenocrates he says, that 'he heard, (*ἤκουσεν*.) that is, 'studied under Plato almost from his infancy.' And so in many other places.

Plutarch commending the natural propensity to virtue, of Dion the Syracusan Brutus, says, that notwithstanding he had lived in the corrupt court of Dionysius the famous tyrant, upon hearing Plato talk, though very young, he was so enamoured with philosophy, that 'he resolved to find opportunities to see that great philosopher, 'and be instructed (*ἀκούσαι*) or taught by him<sup>e</sup>.' And again, when comparing Pelopidas and Epaminondas together, 'They seem both,' says he, 'to have been equally made for all kind of virtues, except 'that Pelopidas delighted most to exercise his body, and Epaminondas by learning to exercise his mind: they spent therefore all 'their leisure hours, one in hunting, wrestling, and the like, and the

<sup>b</sup> ..... Καὶ μὲν

Ἄ Σαλαμὶς γε θρέψαι

Φῶτα μαχατὰν

Δυνατός. Ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἐκτόρ

Ἀλάντος ἄκουσεν. Pindar. Nem. ii. 18.

<sup>c</sup> In ejus vit. lib. ii. Ἀναξίμενης Εὐρύστρατον Μιλήσιος ἤκουσεν Ἀναξίμανδρον. ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ Παρμενίδου φασὶν ἀκούσαι αὐτόν.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. ii. Ἀκούσας δὲ Ἀναξαγόρου, κατὰ

τινας ἀλλὰ καὶ Δάμωνος, ὥς Ἀλεξάνδρος ἐν διαδοχαῖς, μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου καταδίκην διήκουσεν Ἀρχελάου τοῦ φυσικοῦ.

<sup>e</sup> Vit. Xenocrat. Οὗτος ἐκ νέου Πλάτωνος ἤκουσεν.

<sup>f</sup> In Vit. Dion. p. 1756. Ἐσπούδασε, καὶ ἐπράξατο ποιησάμενος σχολήν, αὐτὸν ἐντυχεῖν Πλάτῳ καὶ ἀκούσαι.



‘other in learning, (*ἀκούων*,) or being instructed in something, and ‘in philosophical disputations.’

Thus too he uses the compound *διακούω*, when he remarks out of Stesimbrotus the historian, ‘that Themistocles was instructed (*διακούσαι*) or taught by Anaxagoras<sup>h</sup>.’ Thus in the life of Cicero he says, ‘when he came to Athens, he heard,’ that is, ‘was instructed ‘by or studied under (*δύκουσε*) Antiochus of Scallona, with whose ‘voluble eloquence he was extremely pleased, but did not approve ‘of the new opinions he had started<sup>i</sup>.’ Now in all these cases it is plain the words are used exactly in the same sense as *μαθητεύω*, which they therefore interpret in the places before cited, and are a very home argument that *μαθητεύω* in all such places necessarily implies hearing and learning in one party, and teaching in another.

Notwithstanding this is sufficiently demonstrated in what I have already said, I cannot forbear adding one more illustrious instance, which I remember I have read in Clemens Alexandrinus, where he is shewing that the Jewish philosophy is much the oldest of any other, and that the Grecian was borrowed from it: he cites a passage out of Democritus, where he boasts of his learning and of his travels: which he intimates gave him the advantage of informing himself of many things from wise men in all parts of the world, and from the Egyptians in particular, with whom he says he had conversed eighty years. After this citation Clement adds, ‘He travelled into Babylon, Persia, and Egypt, learning (*μαθητεύων*) ‘of the magi and priests. Pythagoras assures us, that Zoroaster ‘was one of the Persian magi: and those who are of the sect of ‘Prodicus boast they have some hidden mystical books of that ‘great man. Alexander, in his Treatise of Pythagorean Symbols, ‘says, Pythagoras was taught (*μαθητεῦσαι*) or *instructed* by Nazarus the Assyrian, and that besides these, he heard (*ἀκηκοέναι*) or ‘learned of the Druids and Brachmans<sup>k</sup>.’

In this passage, the word in dispute, *μαθητεύω*, is twice used only

<sup>g</sup> In Pelopid. p. 509. Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν πεφυκότες ὁμοίως, πλην ὅτι τῷ γυμνάζεσθαι μᾶλλον ἔχαιρε Πελοπίδας, τῷ δὲ μανθάνειν, Ἐπαμεινώνδας· καὶ τὰς διατριβὰς ἐν τῷ σχολάζειν, ὁ μὲν, περὶ παλαιστρας καὶ κυνηγέσια, ὁ δὲ, ἀκούων τι καὶ φιλοσοφῶν, ἐποίειτο.

<sup>h</sup> Vit. Themistocl. p. 704. Καίτοι Στήσιμβροτος Ἀναξαγόρου τε διακούσας τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα φησί.

<sup>i</sup> Vit. Ciceron. p. 1580. Ἀφικόμενος δ' εἰς Ἀθήνας Ἀντίochu τοῦ Ἀσκαλωνίου διήκουσε, τῇ μὲν εὐροία τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ καὶ χάριτι κηλούμενος, ἣ δ' ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν

ἐνεωτέρειζεν οὐκ ἐπαινῶν.

<sup>k</sup> Stromat. lib. i. p. 304. Ἐπῆλθε γὰρ Βαβυλῶνά τε καὶ Περσίδα καὶ Αἰγύπτου, τοῖς τε μάγοις καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι μαθητεύων. Ζωροάστρην δὲ τὸν Μάγον τὸν Πέρσην ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἐδήλωσεν. Βίβλους ἀποκρύφους τ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε οὐ τὴν Προδίκου μετιόντες αἴρουν αὐχοῦσι κεκτῆσθαι. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Πυθαγορικῶν Συμβόλων, Ναζάρῳ τῷ Ἀσσυρίῳ μαθητεῦσαι ἰστορεῖ τὸν Πυθαγόραν.—ἀκηκοέναι τε πρὸς τούτοις Γαλατῶν καὶ Βραχμάνων τὸν Πυθαγόραν βούλεται.



to signify *to learn*, just in the same sense as ἀκούω is, immediately after in the last sentence, in which likewise the words τε πρὸς τοῦτοις are to be observed, for they connect the sense of the last clause with that of the foregoing: for to say, *besides these he heard, or was taught*, by such or such also, necessarily imports that he had been said before to *have heard or been taught* by others. And you may remember that Clement is there professedly shewing from whence the Greeks had *learned* their philosophy; for this makes it more necessary to understand the passage as I have translated it, it being so very agreeable to his design, but otherwise making nothing to the purpose.

Now, sir, from all I have hitherto said, I am persuaded you will think it is abundantly evident, that μαθητεύω does always, even in the pretended neuter acception, signify *to instruct, teach*, or the like, and that our adversaries have not the least ground to surmise it is ever so much as once used in any case, so as not to include *teaching*. After the instances already given and the considerable illustration of them by parallel passages, wherein παιδεύω and ἀκούω, being used to the same sense, interpret μαθητεύω in the other places: I say, after all this I should not need to recite more instances, but that you intimate it will be very acceptable; and therefore to the rest I add these two or three that follow.

Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking advantageously of philosophy against those who exploded it, from some premises he has before been arguing on, infers thus: ‘Wherefore it is no absurdity to say, ‘that philosophy was given by Divine providence, as a forerunner ‘to prepare and lead us on to that perfection which is in Christ, if ‘it is not ashamed, but learns (μαθητεύουσα) to advance from barbarous wisdom to the truth!’ Again, commending the holy Scriptures to the Greeks, he has these words, which I transcribe at large, because that will give the more force to the instance; ‘The word ‘which enlightens us is more to be valued than gold or precious ‘stones, and more desirable than honey or the honeycomb: for how ‘should that but be extremely desirable, which quickens and invigorates a mind that is buried in darkness, and sharpens the sight ‘of the understanding? For as, if there were no sun, notwithstanding the other stars, all would be night; so if we had not been ‘enlightened by the word, we should not have differed from the ‘fowls which are wont to be fattened in the dark, and nourished for

1 Stromat. lib. vi. p. 690. Οὐκ ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐκ τῆς θείας προνοίας δεδῶσθαι, προπαιδεύουσιν εἰς τὴν διὰ Χριστοῦ

τελείωσιν, ἣν μὴ ἐπαισχύνηται γνῶσκει βαρβάρως μαθητεύουσα φιλοσοφία προκόπτειν εἰς ἀλήθειαν.

‘death. Let us therefore receive the light, and learn of (μαθητεύσωμεν) or be instructed by the Lord<sup>m</sup>.’

As remarkable and plain are several passages in Origen for example, where he is explaining Matt. xiii. 52. ‘By *scribe* there may be understood one that is instructed in (μεμαθητευμένος) that knowledge which is according to the letter of the law<sup>n</sup>.’ And a little after; ‘So this passage also may be expounded tropologically, *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*, to signify that the scribes, that is, those who rest in the bare letter, if they repent, may be instructed (μαθητεύονται) in the spiritual doctrine which, by Christ Jesus, is the quickening word, and is called *the kingdom of heaven*.’ And in the same sense the word several times occurs in this and the next page; to which I will add but one instance more from this Father, taken out of the books he writ against Celsus. Lashing the pride and arrogance of that virulent adversary of Christian religion, who boasted he was thoroughly acquainted with that institution, he says, ‘This is just as if any one who has travelled into Egypt, where the wise men, according to the learning of that country, reason profoundly among themselves about many things which they account sacred; but the common people amuse themselves with some fables which they have heard, and the reason of which they do not comprehend:—it is, I say, just as if such a one shall fancy he understands all the wisdom of the Egyptians when he is taught (μαθητεύσας) only by the empty chat of the vulgar, without having ever been admitted to the conversation of the priests, or been instructed by them in the Egyptian mysteries<sup>p</sup>.’ This passage is the fitter to conclude with, because it is very plain from the design of it, that the word in dispute must here signify *to teach*; and Origen himself explains it so, by μαθὼν, in the last clause,

<sup>m</sup> Protrepitic. p. 70. Γλυκὺς ὁ λόγος ὁ φωτὶς ἡμῶς, ὑπὲρ χρυσίου καὶ λίθου τίμιον· ποθεινὸς ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ μέλι καὶ κηρίον. Πῶς γὰρ οὐ ποθεινὸς ὁ τὸν ἐν σκότει κατοικῶν γινώσκων νοῦν, ἐνεργῇ ποιησάμενος, καὶ τὰ φασφόρα τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποξίνας ὅματα; καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ ἡλίον μὴ ὄντος ἕνεκα τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρων νῦν ἂν ᾗ τὰ πάντα, οὕτως εἰ μὴ τὸν λόγον ἔγνωμεν, καὶ τούτῳ καθυγίσθημεν, οὐδὲν ἂν τῶν σιτευομένων ὀρνίθων ἐλεειπόμεθα, ἐν σκότει πιαινόμενοι, καὶ θανάτῳ τρεφόμενοι. Χωρήσωμεν τὸ φῶς, ἵνα χωρήσωμεν τὸν Θεόν. Χωρήσωμεν τὸ φῶς, καὶ μαθητεύσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ.

<sup>n</sup> Comment. in Matth. p. 218. \*H γραμματεὺς πᾶς ὁ μεμαθητευμένος τῇ κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τοῦ νόμου διδασκαλίᾳ, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Comment. in Matth. p. 219. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τροπολογήσεις τὸ μετανοεῖτε, ἥγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵν’ οἱ γραμμα-

τεῖς, τοῦτέστιν, οἱ τῷ γράμματι ψιλῷ προσαναπαυόμενοι, μετανοοῦντες ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνδοχῆς μαθητεύονται τῇ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐμφύχου λόγου πνευματικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, καλουμένη βασιλείᾳ οὐρανῶν. [Comm. tom. x. Op. vol. iii. p. 458. edit. Benedictin.]

<sup>p</sup> Orig. contra Cels. lib. i. p. 11. Δοκεῖ δέ μοι τοιοῦτόν τι πεποιηκέναι, ὥς εἴ τις τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ἐπιδημήσας, ἐνθα οἱ μὲν Αἰγυπτίων σοφοί, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια γράμματα, πολλὰ φιλοσοφοῦσι περὶ τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς νενομισμένων θείων, οἱ δὲ ἰδιῶται μύθους τινὰς ἀκούσαντες ὦν τοὺς λόγους οὐκ ἐπίστανται, μέγα ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς φρονούσιν· φέτο πάντα τὰ Αἰγυπτίαν ἔγνωκέναι τοῖς ἰδιώταις αὐτῶν μαθητεύσας, καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἱερέων συμμίξας, μηδ’ ἀπὸ τινος αὐτῶν τὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἀπόρρητα μαθόν. [Sect. xii. Op. tom. i. p. 330. edit. Benedict.]

which is most apparently used to signify exactly what before he had expressed by μαθητεύσας.

All this largely shews that the Greek word μαθητεύω does, as I asserted, always signify *to teach* or the like; and that those unsuitable phrases, *to be disciples* or *to make disciples*, if they can ever be admitted, must always be understood to include teaching, for it is this certainly the word principally imports: and therefore the pretended intransitive acceptance of it can be of no service, nor is supported by any one precedent.

But besides I observe, that though the thing I oppose could be defended and all I have been saying had no force, it can nevertheless be no advantage to our adversaries in the present case; because however the word is used in some other places, yet in the commission it is undoubtedly used transitively, expressing an action which is to affect and terminate in the subjects mentioned, viz. all nations; and thus *to teach, instruct, &c.* all nations, is good sense; but *to be disciples* all nations, is nonsense, and cannot be the meaning of infinite wisdom. The construction with an accusative is also a demonstration that the word is here transitive and not neuter; though besides it neither can, nor I believe will be denied, and therefore I need not insist longer upon it.

But further I add, that *discipleship* necessarily includes *teaching*; and therefore though the word could be here rendered *to be a disciple*, yet our antagonists would not be able to avoid the difficulty we press them with; it being enough for us, that however they will strain and torture, the word *teaching* is still necessarily included in it.

On this account also, to render the word *make disciples*, which is much more sensible and proper, can do no manner of hurt to us, nor kindness to our adversaries. Perhaps there may be some colour for this notion of the word in the nature of things; and it is true, there does seem to be something peculiar in the word; for it means not simply *to teach*, but *to teach so as to prevail, to bring over to an opinion, and actually to fix and settle principles* in the persons taught; and this indeed is consequentially making disciples; but then the word does not primarily signify *to make disciples*, but only *to teach successfully*, and so as to prevail. Though the terms are almost reciprocal, and *teaching successfully* is *making disciples*; and *making disciples, teaching successfully*: yet you may observe this difference, that *teaching* is the cause; and being *made disciples* the effect produced by that cause, and following upon it. And therefore, though *to make disciples* were supposed in effect to signify the same thing I plead for, yet I would choose rather to lay that phrase aside, because

it is not the immediate import of the word; and besides, we find by experience, the interests and prejudices of some men can make it liable to ambiguity; which, on the contrary, the primary and immediate sense is wholly free from. If it be rendered *teach*, as you see in all the instances I have given it unavoidably signifies, it can lose nothing of its sense; for *discipleship* will follow if that be to be included; but if it be rendered *make disciples*, our adversaries take an advantage, and attempt to argue us out of the principal signification, pretending it means to *make disciples* in general, not only by *teaching*, but even without it too.

Thus Dr. Hammond, in his Answer to the Query about Infant-Baptism, argues<sup>q</sup>, That the word in the commission does signify simply *to make disciples* of all nations; and he would have the words immediately following to explain and determine the manner how this was to be done, namely, by baptizing them; ‘making this form ‘of baptism,’ says he, ‘their ceremony of receiving them;’ he does not mean of receiving them into church-communion, but into discipleship, that is, appointing this form of baptism alone to be that which makes them disciples; which, whatever it be else, I am sure is no good divinity.

Besides, the doctor never goes about to shew the word is ever once used so: whereas I have largely shewn it cannot be so understood; which I doubt not will weigh more with you, sir, than the doctor’s bare assertion: and if any you shew these letters to, out of deference to the doctor’s learning, shall insist upon his interpretation of the word, I challenge them to shew any instances, or the least tolerable reason to imagine that *μαθητεύω* and *βαπτίζω* are in any degree synonymous, or ever put to signify one and the same thing, or that one ever so explains the other, as it is pretended to do in the commission; nay, or that *μαθητεύω* can once signify in any passage *to make disciples* in general, exclusively of *teaching*. If they will make either of these particulars appear, I will not only alter my present opinion, but always gratefully acknowledge myself very much obliged to them for the favour. I am,

Sir,  
Yours, &c.

#### LETTER VIII.

Dr. HAMMOND explains *μαθητεύσατε*, Matt. xxviii. 19, by John iv. 1, without, if not contrary to, all reason—His unfairness noted—A passage of the bishop of Sarum in favour of the antipædobaptists’ sense of the word: another from Mr. Le Clerc—What Mr. Wall urges from the notion of a disciple, considered

<sup>q</sup> Six Queries, pages 196, 197.



—*Μαθητὴς* is only said of such as are at least capable of being taught—Mr. Wall's groundless and unfair attempt upon Acts xv. 10, to prove the contrary, examined—The words relate only to adult persons—A disciple, in common discourse, ever signifies one that is taught, &c.; so it does likewise among the Latin authors, from whom we borrow it—Proved from the etymology of *discipulus*—By instances from Cicero; from Juvenal; from Terence; from Cornel. Nepos—All the world have had the same notion of a disciple—Instances in the eastern languages—In the Anglo-Saxon—No instance that it is used otherwise in any Greek author; but many of the sense the antipædobaptists plead for—One taken from John ix. 27: one from Acts xviii. 23: another from Dionysius Halicarnassæus. Illustrated also by synonymous words—Instances of *ἀκροατής*; from Diogenes Laertius; from Plutarch—An instance of *ἀκροώμενος* from Plutarch—Of *ἀκουστής* from Ælian; from Dionysius Halicarnassæus—This illustrated by instances from Roman authors; from Cicero—The inference from all this in the present dispute—A passage from Lucian; wherein he explains the phrase 'to make disciples'—Disciple and teacher used as correlates; by Themistius; by Cicero—This applied to the present dispute—The most judicious have always allowed, that the word in the commission particularly signifies *to teach* and *instruct*; as Constantine, Stephens, Leigh, Turretine, Episcopius, Limborch, Cameron, Martin Bucer, Rigaltius, Erasmus, Grotius, Lucas Brugensis—This proved to be the sense of the place from the several versions; the Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Persic, Ethiopic, Arias Montanus, Vulgar Latin—That of Sixtus V; Beza, Erasmus, Castalio; the Italian, Spanish, French, Dutch, Danish, Saxon, Vulgar Greek,—The Fathers of the primitive Church always understood the word in the commission signified *to teach*: thus Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, St. Justin, Eusebius—Apostolical Constitutions; St. Clement, Epiphanius, St. Basil, Tertullian, Clarus bishop of Mascula, St. Hierome—Lastly, this is proved to be the true sense of the place by the authority of the sacred Scriptures themselves—The practice of the apostles—Parallel places—The sum of the evidence—From all it follows, that the commission obliges to teach all that are to be baptized: and therefore that the Scriptures are not so silent concerning the baptizing of infants as the pædobaptists would have us think—So that if Mr. Wall should prove the Jews and Christians did baptize their children, we have still reason enough not to admit the practice.

---

SIR,

THOUGH I concluded my last with a challenge, I do not expect it should be accepted. Dr. Hammond, I am persuaded, was conscious that no instance of that kind could be produced; and therefore he waives it, and only makes an unaccountable reference to what he calls a parallel phrase, John iv. 1, *The Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John.*

But why must this place above all others be singled out for a parallel? Can we imagine the doctor did not know it would have been much more to the purpose to have cited proper instances which are truly parallel, instead of one which is not so? It is to be feared the doctor's prejudices interposed in this case: for, as I observed

before, when he has another design to serve, he readily allows the natural sense of *μαθητεύσατε* (and in the commission particularly) is *to teach*. So he gives it in his paraphrase, and continually in his notes on the place; and says, ‘in other places, when the commission of preaching and gathering disciples is given to the apostles:’ plainly allowing this place to be one where it is given. He expressly interprets the word so when he says, ‘for so the words as they are repeated by St. Mark must necessarily signify, *Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature*; to those of the synagogue first, and then to others also. Thus St. Luke hath set it down most distinctly, ch. xxiv. 47, *that repentance and remission of sins should be preached to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem*.’

Again, he allows that St. Peter only repeats this very commission, when he says, Acts x. 42, *He commanded us to preach unto the people*, &c. Now does not the doctor seem in all this to contradict himself, and pull down at one time what at another he so zealously established? And therefore his suffrage in this case signifies little. Had he not been strongly biassed, he would doubtless have attempted to explain the commission by no other parallel passages but those he has cited in his Annotations.

I know there are several beside the doctor, who give the word the same sense; as bishop Nicholson<sup>a</sup>, Dr. Featly<sup>b</sup>, and indeed most pædobaptists, who attempt to argue from the commission. But of all who translate it thus, the most considerable, I at present remember, are the right reverend bishop of Salisbury, and the learned Mr. Le Clerc; who nevertheless both of them confirm my assertion. His lordship expressly says, that ‘by the first teaching or making of disciples, that must go before baptism, is to be meant the convincing the world<sup>c</sup>,’ &c. And though Mr. Wall is so angry with Mr. Le Clerc at other times, (like the gnat on the bull’s horn in the Arabian fables<sup>d</sup>.) I fancy he was better pleased with him, when he found that learned gentleman asserted *μαθητεύειν* signifies *to make disciples*; and imagined it was giving in to his opinion. But the French version of the New Testament, which Mr. Le Clerc afterwards published with remarks, soon put our author out of humour again, by letting him see that rendering the word so could do him no service: for there he renders it in the text, *faites des disciples*, ‘make disciples;’ and in his remark on it says, ‘This is the proper signification of the word *μαθητεύειν*, and not *to teach*:’ but then he adds immediately, to prevent all

<sup>a</sup> On the Catechism. <sup>b</sup> Dipper Dipped, p. 59. <sup>c</sup> Exposition of the Articles, p. 300.

<sup>d</sup> Lockmanni Fab. <sup>e</sup> C’est le propre sens du verb *matheeteuein*, et non *enseigner*.

mistake, and in contradiction to the common criticism, that 'it is nevertheless very true, that disciples are not made but by teaching<sup>f</sup>.' That is as if he had said, *μαθητεύειν* does indeed mean and include *teaching*; but the full sense of it is not so properly expressed by *teach*, because it signifies something more than simply *to teach*, viz. as I said before, *to convince*, to teach so as to prevail, and bring over to an opinion; which is in effect *to make disciples*. So that the word still necessarily includes *teaching*. And I hardly remember any considerable man that ventures to assert the contrary.

Mr. Wall, to make the cavil seem the more reasonable, endeavours to shew from the notion of a disciple, that persons may be made disciples without being taught, nay, or without so much as being in a capacity of receiving instruction; and infers, since the word, which signifies *to make disciples*, does not necessarily include teaching, it may refer to persons not capable of being taught; and so he thinks the commission may be easily understood to extend to infants as well as adult persons.

But this is sufficiently confuted by the large evidence I have given above of the import of the Greek word, that it does necessarily include teaching as well in the commission, as in all other places where it occurs. And in the next place I will add, that *μαθητής*, or *disciple*, is only said of such as are capable of being taught, and properly belongs to them only in this respect.

All our author says to the contrary, and which I can think it so much as possible any man should be persuaded by, is expressed in these words: 'St. Peter, speaking against the imposing of circumcision on the heathen converts and their children, words it thus, *to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples*: whereas it was infants especially on whom this yoke was attempted to be putg,' Acts xv. 10.

Mr. Wall delivers nothing on this occasion which is likely to deceive the most ignorant, unless it be this passage, wherein he makes so bold with the Scripture, that perhaps such as are too credulous, and not given to examine matters as they ought, may take it for a clear Scripture-proof of the thing. But you, sir, I am satisfied, will see through our author's fallacious misapplication of the text he cites. And how disingenuous is it to insinuate, with as much assurance as if it were plainly expressed, that the holy apostle is speaking against imposing circumcision on the heathen converts and their children? And how much worse is it to assert downright, that 'it was infants especially, on whom this yoke was attempted to be

<sup>f</sup> Quoiqu'il soit vrai que l'on ne fait des disciples, qu'en les enseignant.

<sup>g</sup> Part ii. page 378. [651.]

‘put?’ Any man who reads the passage, even though he be entirely in Mr. Wall’s interest too, cannot but see this assertion is grossly false, and that infants are nowhere mentioned; nor is any thing said which can be applied to them in the whole chapter.

The brethren, ver. 1, on whom this attempt was made, are said to be *taught* that without being circumcised they could not be saved. This cannot include infants. Again, ver. 5, speaking only of those who were converted, the Pharisees said it was needful to circumcise them. And St. James, in ver. 19, very plainly shews us that he did not understand the question to relate at all to infants, but only to the adult; for he confines his determination to them alone: *Wherefore*, says he, *my sentence is, that we trouble not them, who from among the Gentiles are turned to God.* And sure none will say infants can turn from a false religion to God. But the whole scope of the place, the injunctions of that venerable council of the apostles, their letter, and all the circumstances, do very evidently conspire to shew their consultation related not to infants, but only to the adult. Nay, St. Peter, in the words immediately preceding the verse our author cites, says of the persons who are the subject of the dispute, that God had ‘purified their hearts by faith:’ from whence it is plain the persons he spoke of were actual believers; and consequently by *μαθητῶν*, in the following words, the holy apostle intends only the converts, exclusively of their infants, if they had any. This you see, sir, is so very clear, that nothing but prepossession could incline any man to assert, it was infants especially on whom this ‘yoke *was attempted to be put;*’ in hopes he might hence conclude that infants are here called *disciples*, and by consequence must be capable of being made so.

It is a great dishonour and disservice to religion, that any who are teachers of it, and appointed to guide the people, should endeavour to support their fancies and opinions by a fallacy. Nothing, I think, can be more disingenuously urged, or be a more palpable affront to the common sense of mankind, than to affirm *μαθητῆς* may be applied to infants and persons not capable of being taught; for every body constantly uses the word, and always understands it to mean one that is taught or learns. In common discourse it is ever so: and ask a countryman what he means by the word *scholar*, he will tell you he means one that goes to school to learn. And if you ask what he means by *disciple*, he will tell you, such a man’s disciple is one that holds his opinions, and thinks his way best. And you will find the countryman understands his mother-tongue better than some others seem to do; and if he uses more honest simplicity, he uses



more reason too in explaining his meaning, than the bias of interest and parties will suffer some men of letters to do: and if the matter were to be referred, all the world would prefer the good plain sense of the countryman. Now common use, which fixes the sense of words, is an undoubted proof of their signification.

Besides, we may argue not only from the use of the word *disciple* among ourselves, but likewise from the use of it among the Latin authors, from whom we have borrowed it. Now it is plain, *discipulus* is formed from *discere*, to learn. If the name then is imposed on persons for that reason, viz. *quia discunt*, it can be applied to none but such in whom the reason is to be found; otherwise it would be given not only without, but even contrary to the reason of it. But the Latins always used it, according to its etymology, to signify *one that was taught* (*qui discit*, says Stephens, *one that learns*); and Cicero promiscuously uses *discipulus* and *discens*, a learner, as synonymous words.

In that strange relation concerning Diodotus the Stoic philosopher, he says, that even after he was blind, 'though it seems almost impossible to be done without the use of sight, yet he taught geometry, directing his scholars, (*discentibus*), or pupils, or disciples, 'by words, whence and whither, and what lines they should draw<sup>h</sup>.' What he here means by *discens* is in other places expressed by *discipulus*. Thus in a letter to Papirius, he says, 'Hirtius and Dolabella are my scholars, or disciples, (*discipuli*), or students in oratory, and my masters in feasting<sup>i</sup>.' The same opposition of master and scholar Juvenal makes; when lashing those who instil their own covetous principles into their children, he says, 'Take my word for it, the scholar will outgo the master<sup>k</sup>.' Old Simo in Terence uses *discipulus* in the same sense; speaking to Davus, by whom he supposes Pamphilus was tutored and advised; 'Why do not you mind your pupil, (*discipuli*), and give him better instructions<sup>l</sup>?' Nepos, in the Life of Epaminondas, remarks, that 'he did not discharge his tutor, till he had gone far beyond his fellow-scholars (*condiscipulos*) in learning; by which it was easy to foresee he would excel as much in other things<sup>m</sup>.'

<sup>h</sup> Cic. Quæst. Tuscul. lib. v. cap. 39. Tum quod sine oculis fieri posse vix videtur, geometriæ munus tuebatur, verbis præcipiens discentibus, unde, quo, quamque lineam scriberent.

<sup>i</sup> Epist. Famil. lib. ix. Epist. 16. Hirtium ego, et Dolabellam dicendi discipulos habeo, cœnandi magistros.

<sup>l</sup> Andria, Act. 3. Scen. i. 19. Si Num immemores discipuli?

<sup>m</sup> Pag. 138. Neque prius eum a se dimiserit, quam in doctrinis tanto antecesserit condiscipulos, ut facile intelligi posset, pari modo superaturum omnes in cæteris artibus.

<sup>k</sup>

Meliorem præsto magistro  
Discipulum.

Satyr. xiv. 211.

From these instances, instead of infinite others which might be produced, it is plain, that those from whom we borrow the word *disciple*, meant by it one that *is taught*, or that *learns*. And the same notion of a disciple all the world have had as well as the Romans: therefore in the Hebrew (and other eastern languages to the same effect) a disciple is תלמיד, from הלמד in *hiphil*, which signifies *to make to learn*, or *to teach*: and למד from למד in *piel*, which signifies the same thing: and so likewise in the Anglo-Saxon, *Leorning-eniht* is a *disciple*, or *scholar*, from *leornigan*, *to learn*. It is therefore one of the most unreasonable things that can be, to insist upon any other contrary sense, which besides is not countenanced even by the common use of the word among ourselves.

Our author takes his argument for the sense he gives the word, from the Scriptures: but neither in that sacred book, nor any one Greek author, is μαθητής ever once used as he pretends. The place he particularly cites has been examined already, and turned against him: and he is opposed also by many others. John ix. 27. says the man who was born blind, *Wherefore would ye hear it again? will ye also be his disciples?* that is, will ye also believe in him, and submit yourselves to his instruction, and become his followers? Again, Acts xviii. 23. *He went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples.* Doubtless all the disciples then were capable of being confirmed in the faith they had *all* received; for it is plain, no other are here acknowledged for disciples, but such as believed; for *all the disciples* were strengthened.

And so in all other instances the word is only applied to adult persons, who were actually taught, agreeably to the sense it is used in by other authors. So Theopompus the historian is called by Dionysius Halicarnassæus ‘the most famous of Isocrates’ scholars or ‘disciples<sup>n</sup>,’ (μαθητῶν,) that is, of all who were brought up or instructed by Isocrates. And it is frequent to meet with Πλάτωνος μαθητής, Ἀριστοτέλους, Σωκράτους μαθητής, and the like, to signify such as were instructed by Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, &c.; and it may be illustrated further by those words which are used as synonymous to it. Thus Diogenes Laertius, in the life of Strato Lampascenus, observing that there had been eight noted men of that name, says, ‘the first was Isocrates’ hearer or scholar (ἀκροατής); ‘the second, this person whose life I am writing; the third was a ‘physician, a disciple (μαθητής) of Erasistratus<sup>o</sup>,’ &c. It is to be

<sup>n</sup> Epist. ad Pompeium de Præcipuis Historic. cap. 6. Ἐπιφανέστατος πάντων Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν γενόμενος.

<sup>o</sup> Lib. v. Πρώτος Ἰσοκράτους ἀκροατής. δεύτερος, αὐτὸς οὗτος. τρίτος, μαθητής Ἐρασιστράτου, &c.

noted here, that ἀκροατὴς and μαθητὴς are promiscuously used to mean the same thing: now as the former necessarily implies actual instruction, μαθητὴς must do so too.

Indeed what is meant by μαθητὴς in some places, we find commonly enough expressed by ἀκροατὴς, ἀκουστής, &c., in others; which being therefore parallel passages, are justly brought to explain one another: for which reason I will give you a few instances.

Plutarch, speaking of Lysurgus, says, that ‘he first studied philosophy, being a hearer, (ἀκροατὴς,) scholar, or disciple, of Plato the philosopher<sup>p</sup>.’ Again, speaking of Hyperidas, he says, ‘he had been a hearer or disciple (ἀκροατὴς) of Plato the philosopher; together with Lysurgus and Isocrates<sup>q</sup>.’ Sometimes he expresses the same thing by ἀκροώμενος, as in the life of Isocrates, ‘he was a disciple or hearer (ἀκροώμενος) of Prodicus the Chian, and of Gorgias the Leontine<sup>r</sup>,’ &c. And sometimes again we meet with ἀκουστής, to the same effect: thus Ælian says, ‘Zoilus of Amphipolis, who wrote against Homer and Plato and others, was a disciple or hearer (ἀκουστής) of Polycrates the Athenian<sup>s</sup>.’ So Dionysius Halicarnassæus calls Cephisodorus the Athenian ‘a true and proper disciple or hearer (ἀκουστής) of Isocrates<sup>t</sup>.’ To which perfectly agrees that parallel phrase of the same author, in a letter to Pompey concerning Plato; where, excusing himself for his free censure of that great philosopher, he recounts several who had taken the same liberty before him: ‘the first of whom,’ says he, ‘was his own scholar or disciple, (μαθητὴς,) Aristotle<sup>u</sup>,’ &c. There is no other difference in these phrases, but that μαθητὴς in one is expressed by ἀκουστής in the other; which plainly shews the words to be synonymous in all such cases.

And so likewise the Roman authors, who are constant imitators of the Greeks, have the same expression. Cicero, the great master of Roman eloquence, having mentioned Theophrastus, adds, ‘For Strato, who was his disciple, scholar, or hearer (*auditor*), though a man of excellent parts<sup>x</sup>,’ &c. And elsewhere, discoursing of the chief good, and mentioning Critolaus, he says, ‘Diodorus his disciple (*auditor*) carried the notion further, and thought besides

<sup>p</sup> Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1545. Ἀκροατὴς δὲ γενόμενος Πλάτωνος τοῦ φιλοσόφου, τὰ πρῶτα ἐφιλοσόφησεν.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. p. 1559. Ἀκροατὴς δὲ Πλάτωνος γενόμενος τοῦ φιλοσόφου, ἅμα Λυκούργου, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Vit. decem Rhetor. p. 1538. Ἀκροώμενος Προδίκου τε τοῦ Χίου, καὶ Γοργίου τοῦ Λεοντίνου.

<sup>s</sup> Var. Hist. lib. xi. cap. 10. Ζωίλος ὁ

Ἀμφιπολίτης, ὁ καὶ εἰς Ὅμηρον γράψας, καὶ εἰς Πλάτωνα, καὶ εἰς ἄλλους, Πολυκράτους μὲν ἀκουστής ἐγένετο.

<sup>t</sup> De Isocrat. Judic. cap. 18. pag. 163. Γνησιώτατος ἀκουστής ἐγένετο.

<sup>u</sup> Pag. 203. Πρῶτον μὲν, ὁ γνησιώτατος αὐτοῦ μαθητὴς Ἀριστοτέλης, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Academic. Quest. lib. i. cap. 9. Nam Strato, ejus auditor, quanquam fuit acri ingenio, &c.



‘virtue, there should be freedom from all pain.’ In another place he has put *auditor* and *discipulus* together, and plainly means the same thing by them. ‘Heraclides Ponticus,’ says he, ‘a learned man, hearer and disciple of Plato, writes, that the mother of Phalaris dreamed she saw the images of the gods,’ &c.

It sufficiently appears then from hence, that *μαθητής*, or a disciple, does undoubtedly mean a hearer or learner; and so to *make disciples* must imply to teach them, or to make them hearers, viz. by reading lectures, and instructing them, or the like.

Perhaps it may not be amiss to observe here, how well this agrees with some words of Cicero concerning Dion the Sicilian; of whom, as we noted before, Plutarch says, that he was very desirous to hear (*ἀκούσαι*) or be instructed by Plato. As Cornelius Nepos also expresses it, ‘He was extremely desirous (*audiendi*) of hearing him<sup>a</sup>.’ But Cicero in one place calls him Plato’s disciple; ‘Dion, who was of Plato’s school, when his son was killed by a fall from the top of a house, not only gave no signs of grief, but calmly went on with what he happened to be doing at the time, without any commotion; by which this great man and disciple of Plato shewed how others, who would be thought wise, should behave themselves<sup>b</sup>.’ In another place, speaking of the same person, he says, ‘Who was it that enriched Dion of Syracuse with all kind of learning? Was it not Plato? &c. Did Plato instruct Dion in any other arts<sup>c</sup>? &c. In the former passage he calls Dion ‘Plato’s disciple;’ and in the latter, he explains what he meant by it, and says, he was instructed by Plato: as if both expressions amounted to one and the same thing; and that to call any one Plato’s disciple, was just the same as to say, he was taught by Plato.

Thus Lucian also, who perhaps understood the propriety of the Greek as well as any man, has expounded it. Anacharsis was come from Scythia to Greece to learn of Solon, &c. the wisdom and manners of the Grecians, and the art of government, as he himself says; and Lucian introduces him saying to Solon, ‘You cannot be

<sup>y</sup> De Finib. Bon. et Mal. lib. v. cap. 5. Diodorus, ejus auditor, adjungit ad honestatem, vacuitatem doloris.

<sup>z</sup> De Divinatione, lib. i. cap. 23. Matrem Phalaridis scribit Ponticus Heraclides, doctus vir, auditor, et discipulus Platonis, visam esse videre in somniis simulacra deorum, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Vit. x. Dion. cap. 2. p. 98, 99. Dion ejus audiendi cupiditate flagraret.

<sup>b</sup> De Consol. p. 567. a. Dion certe, qui e Platonis schola defluxit, cum ejus filius in atrium c. tecto delapsus interisisset, non

modo non doluit, sed etiam in eo, quod tum forte agebat, constanter perstitit; quo facto judicavit et vir sapiens et Platonis discipulus, quid cæteros, qui sapientes haberi volunt, facere oporteat. [Ciceron. Op. fol. Hamburgi, 1618. tom. iv. p. 315. l. 50.]

<sup>c</sup> De Oratore, lib. iii. p. 131 a. [cap. 34.] Quis Dionem Syracusium doctrinis omnibus expolivit? non Plato? &c. Aliisne igitur artibus hunc Dionem instituit Plato, &c.



‘ more willing to teach (διδάσκων) me, and make me your disciple, (μαθητὴν ποιούμενος,) than I shall be, with pleasure, to hear you discourse of laws and government<sup>d</sup>.’ Here it is necessarily imported, that *to make a disciple is to teach*; and that it is the office of a disciple or scholar to hear and *learn*. And therefore too we sometimes find μαθητὴς and διδάσκαλος, a *teacher* or *master*, used as correlates; and as such, opposed to each other: so Themistius, in a speech to the senate, says, ‘ Though I am not capable of saying any thing worthy of this audience, but what I have before learned from you; yet I have strangely ventured to take upon me the part of a master, instead of that of a disciple<sup>e</sup>.’ Evidently importing, that μαθητὴς is a *learner* or a *hearer*, ἀκροατὴς, as the same author elsewhere expresses it<sup>f</sup>. Cicero likewise, using the same kind of opposition, says, ‘ Panætius the master or teacher (*doctor*) of Posidonius, but the scholar or disciple (*discipulus*) of Antipater, degenerated indeed from the Stoics, or the chief men of that sect’——.

Now the terms of a relation, according to the logicians, you know, sir, mutually imply and relate to each other; and therefore as master implies a scholar to whom he is master, so scholar implies a master to whom he is scholar; and the ground of these relations is teaching in the master and learning in the scholar; which therefore either term of the relation does always necessarily import.

By this time I have certainly carried it beyond all possibility of doubting, that μαθητὴς and μαθητεύω do ever include *teaching* in their signification. And to all I have still this to add, that notwithstanding some of the pædobaptists generally build so much upon this common criticism, and think their cause sufficiently secured by it, the most judicious and learned men have always asserted, that the word does (at least in the commission) signify *to teach* and *instruct*. I do not desire you should take this on my word, and therefore I will produce some instances of it; for in matters of this nature I trust nobody myself, nor would have any body trust me.

I need not repeat what I have before noted from the bishop of Salisbury<sup>h</sup>, and Dr. Whitby<sup>i</sup>, nor how much even Dr. Hammond<sup>k</sup> has been shewn to acknowledge the true meaning of the word: but I will go on to observe, that Constantine, though he thinks the

<sup>d</sup> De Gymnas. p. 276. “Ὅστε οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις διδάσκων με, καὶ μαθητὴν ποιούμενος, ὥς ἐγωγε ἡδέως——ἐπακούοιμι περὶ πολιτείας τι καὶ νόμων διεξιόντος.

<sup>e</sup> Orat. xiii. p. 298. “Ὅστε καὶ νῦν, οὐδὲν ἄλλο εἰπὼν δεξιὼς ἢ ἂ παρ’ ὑμῖν ἔμαθον ῥήματα, ἀντὶ μαθητοῦ ἀμφισβητῶ διδάσκαλος εἶναι.

<sup>f</sup> Orat. ii. p. 53.

<sup>g</sup> De Divinatione, lib. i. cap. 3. Sed a Stoicis, vel principibus ejus disciplinae, Posidonii doctor, discipulus Antipatri, degeneravit Panætius, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Supra, p. 169.

<sup>i</sup> Supra, p. 169.

<sup>k</sup> Supra, p. 168, 189.

word sometimes means *to be* or *to make disciples*; yet he says, that it signifies *doceo*<sup>l</sup>, διδάσκω, *to teach*, as the primary and more genuine sense; and for this he cites the commission, Matth. xxviii. 19, as a plain undoubted instance; and so before him does Henry Stephens<sup>m</sup>; for when he says the word signifies *doceo, to teach*, without any hesitation he confirms it by this commission, as supposing it to be an unexceptionable instance to that purpose. And Leigh<sup>n</sup> from these does just the same thing.

That profound Calvinist divine, Monsieur Turretine, says, infants 'are no more capable of actual faith, than they are of that instruction with which the adult are to be taught and made disciples of Christ, Matth. xxviii. 19<sup>o</sup>.' And in another place, he says, 'Christ, sending his apostles to gather a church, supposes the necessity of a precedaneous instruction and knowledge of his doctrines; Matth. xxviii. 19, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them*.' And so he goes on, by other passages likewise, to confirm this method of making church members. I know this same gentleman, treating of infant-baptism in another place, denies again that the word means *to teach*<sup>q</sup>; but how these contradictions can be reconciled, let the reader judge: those who will give themselves the liberty to think, will doubtless see it would be nothing but the prejudice of education that made him deny what he had at least twice before asserted in the same system.

Episcopius, the judicious Remonstrant, establishing the divine authority of water-baptism, has, among the rest, this remarkable passage to our purpose: 'Perhaps you will object, that μαθητεύσατε does not signify properly *to teach*, but *to make disciples*. Be it so; yet they could not make disciples but by teaching them, and by teaching them those things which belonged to the Christian religion: for *disciple* and *doctor*, or *teacher*, are relatives. Therefore St. Mark xvi. 15, does not use μαθητεύειν, but κηρύττειν, i. e. *to preach* or *teach*. Besides, μαθητεύειν, or the Hebrew מְלִמְדִּים does not in this place signify barely *to teach*, but *to teach so as to gain disciples* תלמידים<sup>r</sup>; &c.

<sup>l</sup> Lexic. ad voc.

<sup>m</sup> Thesaur. ad voc.

<sup>n</sup> Critica Sacra, ad voc. in margin.

<sup>o</sup> Institut. Theolog. par. ii. p. 640. § 9. [Locus xv. Quæst. 14.] Cujus non magis capaces sunt, quam illius institutionis, qua docentur adulti, et discipuli Christi fiunt, Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. par. iii. p. 3. § 8. Christus mittens apostolos ad ecclesiæ collectionem supponit necessitatem institutionis et cog-

nitionis doctrinæ præcedanæ, Matt. xxviii. 19. *Ite docete omnes.*

<sup>q</sup> Institut. Theolog. part. iii. p. 464. § 4. [Where, it ought to be added, Turretine has an express inquiry and dissertation (Quæstio 20.) on the point of infants' baptism, and determines against the anabaptists, chiefly on the ground of this very command of Christ.]

<sup>r</sup> Respons. ad Quæst. 37. p. 35, 36. Dices: μαθητεύσατε non significat proprie

Mr. Limborch answering the same objection with Episcopius, and with the same design, says, '1. They could not make disciples but by teaching. 2. By this instruction the disciples were brought over to the faith before they were baptized, Mark xvi. 15, 16<sup>s</sup>.' And again elsewhere he says, 'Hence also our Lord commanded, that men should first be taught and brought over to the faith, and after that be baptized, Matth. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15, 16<sup>t</sup>.'

Cameron on the place says, 'μαθητεύειν signifies simply διδάσκειν, *to teach*; but here, *to teach what relates to religion*<sup>u</sup>.' The famous Martin Bucer allows the sense which the antipædobaptists contend for, and does not in the least attempt to evade it; for to the argument which we draw from the commission, he only says, 'The anabaptists think they argue very strongly against infant-baptism from this place. But I have answered their objection above, chap. iii. And till they can find a place where they are commanded to baptize none but those that are taught, this text will be of no advantage to their opinion<sup>x</sup>.' So that Bucer acknowledges here the word does mean *to teach*; and fancies infant-baptism cannot hence be proved unlawful, for no other reason, but because it is not said expressly, *baptize such only as are taught*. But how weak and trifling this is, every one that reads it must see. He refers indeed to chap. iii. for a fuller answer; but all he says there is, that the commission speaks only of adult persons, and that it is no wonder therefore it should put teaching before baptizing.

Rigaltius argues professedly from this sense of the words, in his note on St. Cyprian's sixty-fourth epistle. The passage is worth reading, but too large to be here transcribed, and therefore I can give you but a taste of it: 'This may be gathered,' says he, 'from what has been said above, where the words of our Lord are exceeding clear, who commands to teach before they baptize<sup>y</sup>.'

*docete*, sed *discipulos docete*. Esto inquam. At discipulos facere non poterant nisi docerent, et quatenus docerent ea, quæ ad religionem Christi pertinebant. *Discipulus* enim et *doctor* sunt relata: unde Marcus, cap. xvi. 15, non utitur verbo μαθητεύειν sed verbo κηρύττειν, id est *prædicare*, sive *docere*. Deinde μαθητεύειν sive Hebræum הלמד non significat hoc loco simpliciter *docere* tantum, sed *docere ita ut discipulos*, sive הלמידים *consequaris*, &c. [Apud Episcopii Opera, tom. i. part. 2.]

<sup>s</sup> Institut. lib. v. cap. 67. § 7. 1. Non poterant discipulos facere, nisi docendo. 2. Per institutionem illam discipuli ad fidem adducebantur, antequam baptizarentur, Marc. xvi. 15, 16.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. cap. 68. sect. 2. Hinc et Dominus prius homines doceri et ad fidem suam perducere, dein baptizari jubet, Matth. xxviii. 19; Marc. xvi. 15, 16.

<sup>u</sup> Quia simpliciter μαθητεύειν est διδάσκειν, *docere*; sed *docere ea quæ pertinent ad religionem*.

<sup>x</sup> Enarrat. in 4. Evangel. in loc. p. 204. Anabaptistæ infantium baptismum fortissime oppugnare sibi videntur. Sed his responsum supra est, cap. 3. Sane dum non habent locum, quo præcipitur, tantum doctos baptizare, nihil roboris suæ sententiæ hinc adferent.

<sup>y</sup> Cyprian. p. 280. not. a. Hoc necessario colligi videtur ex antedictis, ubi apertissima sunt verba Domini, jubentis docere, priusquam tingere.

Erasmus in his Annotation on Matth. xxvii. 57, cites the commission as an instance in which the word is used transitively, and signifies *to teach*; and accordingly translates it *docete, teach all nations*. And in his paraphrase on the words, he takes it altogether in that sense.

The incomparable Grotius explains the Greek word by a passage he quotes from the Constitutions ascribed to St. Clement; without naming the place indeed, but you may find the words exactly as he has transcribed them, lib. vii. cap. 40, ‘All ungodliness and impiety,’ says he, ‘must be first removed, and the contrary principles of true holiness introduced, and so they must be baptized<sup>z</sup>.’ In the Annotation on the verse following the commission, concerning which the dispute is, he remarks, that there are two sorts of teaching: the one more imperfect, by way of initiation into the first principles; the other more complete, by a fuller and more accurate instruction: and ‘the former,’ says he, ‘seems to be the import of the word *μαθητεύειν*: for it means to initiate as it were into the doctrines, and this is to precede baptism; the fuller instruction is signified by *διδάσκειν*, and is here placed after baptism<sup>a</sup>.’

To these I will add but one authority more, namely, that of Lucas Brugensis, who in his note on verse 19, says, ‘he commands them to teach<sup>b</sup>.’ And afterwards, in the note on verse 20, he has these words: *Διδάσκοντες*] ‘The evangelist,’ says he, ‘uses another word in the verse above, where we read *μαθητεύσατε*: the difference between them seems to be this, that *μαθητεύειν* signifies to teach those who are yet utter strangers to the doctrine, and not under your tutorage, so as to make them disciples; but *διδάσκειν* means to teach such as are already become disciples, and give themselves up to your instructions. And this difference suits very well with the place: for Christ commanded first to teach the nations which are strangers to God and the truth; and afterwards, when they have submitted themselves to the truth, to teach them those precepts and rules of life which are worthy God and the truth they profess<sup>c</sup>. “The order here observed, says St. Hierome, is ex-

<sup>z</sup> In loc. Sensus explicat scriptor Constitutionum quæ Clementi adscribuntur, Δεῖ ἡμᾶς πρότερον πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν ἐξελόντας ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, τότε τὴν εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῖς ἐγκαταβάλλεσθαι, καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀξιώσθαι.

<sup>a</sup> Grot. in Matt. xxviii. 20. Cum duplex sit docendi ratio, alia per modum εισαγωγῆς τῶν στοιχειουμένων, alia per modum διδασκαλίας, prior supra videtur indicari verbo *μαθητεύειν*; id enim est

velut in disciplinam initiare, et baptismo preponitur: posterior verbo *διδάσκειν*, quod hic post baptismum locatur.

<sup>b</sup> In 4. Evangel. Jubet eos docere. [Lucas Brugensis wrote *doceri*; but Mr. Gale translates as if it were *docere*.]

<sup>c</sup> *Διδάσκοντες*] Alia est vox Græca versu superiori, ubi legitur—*μαθητεύσατε*: discrimen hoc esse videtur, quod *μαθητεύειν* sit, *docere* eos qui a doctrina et magisterio tuo sunt alieni ita ut reddas



‘cellent : he commands the apostles, first to teach all nations ; and ‘after that, to dip them with the sacrament of faith ; and then, to ‘shew them how they must behave themselves after their faith and ‘baptism.” Before baptism, they are to be taught the truth of the ‘Gospel, especially matters of faith ; but after baptism, they are to ‘be instructed in the Christian morals, and what concerns their ‘practice.’

It would be easy to bring several other authorities ; but these I think sufficient to shew that some of the best judges acknowledge my sense of the word. And now, in the next place :

2. I am to confirm this to be the meaning of it in the commission, by the several versions which have been made : for of all I have yet seen, and am capable of finding the sense of, not one renders it otherwise. Mr. Wall, on this very occasion, takes the liberty positively to assert, that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew ; though it has been shewn to be very improbable, (or at least exceeding doubtful,) by men of great reputation, and therefore is a notion not fit to ground an argument upon. All the use he makes of this remark is to insinuate, that probably the word which St. Matthew originally used might better bear to be rendered, and more properly signify, only to *proselyte*, or *enter as a disciple*, without implying *to teach*, as the Greek word by which it is translated does. His words are these : ‘The common language of the ‘Jews, (in which language it was that St. Matthew wrote this ‘Gospel,) as it does not admit of this phrase, *an infant is taught*, or ‘*instructed* ; so it very well allows of this other, *such or such an ‘infant is entered a disciple*, or *made a proselyte* to such a profession ‘or religion<sup>d</sup>.’

Though it is very doubtful, at least, whether St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew or not ; yet, supposing he did, our adversaries can have no help from thence at all : for,

1. It is very likely the ancient translator of that Gospel into Greek, whoever he was, (some think it was St. Matthew himself,) understood the force of the original word at least as well as our author can do, who does not know what the word was. But,

2. We cannot guess what word was used in the supposed Hebrew

*discipulos* : διδάσκειν vero, *docere jam discipulos redditos, et magisterio tuo addictos tanquam præceptorem*: quod discrimen loco optime congruit. Jubet enim Jesus, prius ut gentes a Deo et veritate alienæ veritatem doceantur : deinde postquam veritati colla subdiderint, doceantur præcepta vitæ Deo ac veritate dignæ. ‘Ordo — ‘pulcherrimus,’ inquit Hieronymus, —

‘jussit apostolis, ut primum docerent ‘universas gentes, deinde fidei intingerent ‘sacramento, et post fidem ac baptismum ‘quæ essent observanda præciperent.’ Ante baptismum docenda est veritas evangelica, docenda sunt ea potissimum quæ sunt fidei, post baptismum ea quæ sunt morum.

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. p. 378. [651.]

original, better than from the Hebrew and other Oriental versions which are now extant; and these make strongly against Mr. Wall. The Hebrew copy, printed at Paris 1584, reads תלמדו; and that published by Hutterus reads למדו from למד, whose signification no man questions to be *didicit, docuit, he learned, he taught*, or the like. In *kal* it signifies *learn*, Jerem. x. 2; in *piel*, *teach*, as Psalm xciv. 12. The Syriac version likewise reads it ܬܠܡܕܘ, exactly in the same sense, and from the same root ܬܠܡܕ, *erudit, he taught*, or *instructed*. The Arabian translator, using just the same word, reads تلمدوا, which signifies properly *to teach*, as Acts xix. 20; Matt. xiii. 52. The Persic, indeed, I know nothing of; but Mr. Sam. Clerk, of Merton college, Oxon, in the Polyglot, translates the place, *docete, teach*; and therefore it is to be presumed that version also favours our cause as much as the others undoubtedly do. The Ethiopic is most express; for I do not know that መሠረ is ever once used to signify any thing else but *teach, learn, &c.* Wemmers<sup>e</sup>, in his Lexicon, and Ludolphus after him, and Castellus, render it by *teach*, but never give the least intimation that it is any where used in a sense which can favour our adversaries; and I think I may be positive, no man can produce an instance from the Scriptures where it does not mean properly *to teach, learn, &c.*, except only from the Old Testament, where indeed it sometimes signifies *to prey, or plunder*; a sense which can do our antagonists no service: but the Lexicons furnish us with instances enough of its proper sense; to which might be added Matth. xi. 1. and 1 Cor. xv. 2, 3; Gal. i. 8, 9, and, to the best of my knowledge, all other places where the word occurs, at least in the New Testament. It may be further noted, that this Ethiopic word bears considerable affinity in sense and is the same in orthography with the Arabic مهرا, which is rendered *peritus fuit*, 'he was skilled,' or 'learned,' in the Catalogue drawn up by the admirable Bochart, and afterwards enlarged by Ludolphus<sup>f</sup>, to shew the agreement of the Ethiopic with other eastern languages.

Hence it is plain, all the Oriental versions we know of understand and render the commission so as to make μαθητεύσατε signify *to teach*. To these we may add Arias Montanus, the Vulgar Latin, and that corrected by command of Sixtus V., Beza's version, and that of

<sup>e</sup> [See Jacobi Wemmers' Lexicon Æthiopicum, 4to. Romæ, 1638.

Jobi Ludolphi Lex. Æthiop. 4to. Lond. 1661.—fol. Francofurti, 1699. Edm. Castellii Lexicon Heptaglotton, fol. Londini,

1669.]

<sup>f</sup> [See this, as a preliminary dissertation, attached to his Ethiopic Grammar, fol. Frankfort, 1699.]

Erasmus, which render it by *docete*; and Castalio's, which has it *doctum, teach*. The old Italian version reads *insegnate, to teach*; and Diodati renders it *ammaestrare*, in the same sense. A Spanish edition at hand has *enseñad*; the French, printed at Lyons, renders the word by *enseigner*; and that which was made by the gentlemen of Geneva, by *instruiser*, all signifying properly and literally *to teach*: as likewise do the Dutch version, which reads *leert*, the Danish *lærer*, and the Saxon edition, published by Junius, *lærað*. And the late version into the vulgar or modern Greek, made for the use of the Greek church, renders it *διδάσκειτε*, the same word which in Matt. xxviii. 20, (the verse next to that which has the word in dispute,) our adversaries say, signifies literally and properly *to teach*. And I think all our English translations likewise do constantly render the commission, *teach all nations, &c.*, which must appear to be the true sense of the place: for the admirable and exact agreement of so many, and perhaps all, translations, and the judgment of so many learned gentlemen employed in making them, is very considerable, and will certainly be allowed a great argument in the case, strongly to confirm our sense, as expressed in the common English version, to be the true, and the most conformable to the original.

3. In the third place I am to shew you that the Fathers of the primitive church also understood the words in the same sense. Clemens Alexandrinus reads the place thus: '*Go about and preach, (κηρύσσετε,) and such as shall believe, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*' So Origen likewise takes it in this passage<sup>h</sup>: 'The apostles therefore left Israel, and obeyed our Saviour's command, *Teach all nations*; and, *You shall be unto me witnesses both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, &c.* They did therefore as they were commanded in Jerusalem and Judæa; but when the Jews rejected the word, for *a prophet has no honour in his own country*, then they turned to the Gentiles.' It is plain Origen speaks of the apostles' preaching, and cites the words in dispute, Matt. xxviii. 19, as the commission Christ gave them to do so. Again, mentioning the completion of several of our Lord's prophecies, among the rest he places this: '*We every day,*' says he,

<sup>g</sup> Epitom. p. 800 C. Περιόντες κηρύσσετε, καὶ τοὺς πιστεύοντας βαπτίζετε εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

<sup>h</sup> Comment. in Matt. p. 225. Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι διὰ τοῦτο κατέλιπον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, ἐποίησαν δὲ τὸ προστεταγμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος· Μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ

τὸ· Ἐσεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ, &c. πεποιήκασιν μὲν οὖν τὸ προστεταγμένον ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ προφῆτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει, μὴ παραδεξαμένων Ἰουδαίων τὸν λόγον, ἀπεληλύθασιν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. [Op. fol. Rothom. 1668. tom. i. 225.]



‘ see the fulfilling of those things our Lord long since foretold, as  
 ‘ that the Gospel shall be preached in all the world, and that the  
 ‘ disciples going forth should preach the word to all nations;’ &c.  
 In another place he takes notice of the wisdom of Divine providence  
 in facilitating the work of the apostles, by bringing so great a part  
 of the world under the Roman emperor’s jurisdiction : ‘ that it might  
 ‘ not be rendered,’ says he, ‘ too difficult for the apostles to execute  
 ‘ the commands their Lord had given them to *go and teach all*  
 ‘ *nations*. It is certain that Jesus was born in the reign of  
 ‘ Augustus, a prince, who as it were prepared the way for him, by  
 ‘ reducing so many kingdoms into one. For had all different states  
 ‘ remained distinct, under separate independent governors, it might  
 ‘ have been a considerable obstruction to the spreading of the doc-  
 ‘ trine of Jesus through all the world.’ It is plain that Origen in  
 this passage cites and understands the commission in dispute, only  
 in the sense we contend for; *teach all nations*, being explained in  
 the last clause by ‘ spreading the doctrine of Jesus through all the  
 ‘ world.’

The exposition of faith attributed to St. Justin has this passage :  
 ‘ Our Lord Jesus Christ, being about to return into heaven after his  
 ‘ resurrection from the dead, gives his apostles a charge concerning  
 ‘ teaching the nations, and the doctrine of baptism, in these words ;  
 ‘ *Go teach*’<sup>k</sup>, &c. And the same Father, in his treatise entitled ‘ A  
 ‘ Dialogue with Trypho the Jew,’ speaking of teaching and con-  
 verting the nations, and alluding to the commission, Matt. xxviii.  
 19, says, ‘ When Christ came and sent forth his disciples, he  
 ‘ instructed (ἐμαθήτευσεν) or taught them, i. e. *the nations*’<sup>l</sup>.

Eusebius says, ‘ The apostles went out and preached to the nations  
 ‘ with the power and authority of Christ, who had said unto them,  
 ‘ *Go teach all nations in my name*’<sup>m</sup>.’ By which it is plain he under-  
 stood these words meant *to preach the Gospel*.

<sup>i</sup> Contra Celsum, lib. ii. p. 84. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄρῳντες πληρούμενα τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πρὶν γενέσθαι. τὸ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ· καὶ πορευθέντας αὐτοῦ τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὴν λόγον αὐτοῦ κατηγγελέκειναι.

<sup>j</sup> Contra Celsum, lib. ii. p. 79. ἵνα μὴ —χαλεπώτερον γένηται τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὸ ποιῆσαι ὕπερ προσέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἰπών. Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. καὶ σαφές γε, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Αὐγούστου βασιλείαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς γεγέννηται, τοῦ (ἢ οὕτως ὀνομάσω) ὁμαλίσαντος διὰ μιᾶς βασιλείας τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς. ἣν δ’ ἂν ἐμπόδιον τοῦ νευμθῆναι τὴν

Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίαν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ, πολλὰς εἶναι βασιλείας, &c.

<sup>k</sup> Expos. Fidei, p. 376 A. Ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἄνοδον ποιῆσθαι μέλλων, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν μαθητείαν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος διδασκίαν τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐπαίδευσεν, λέγων, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Page 272. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἐλθὼν, διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, πέμψας ἐμαθήτευσεν αὐτούς.

<sup>m</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 5. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ τοῦ κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ τὴν εἰς σύμπαντα τὰ ἔθνη στείλαμένων πορεύαν σὺν



The Apostolical Constitutions, which are of considerable antiquity, though not so ancient as it is pretended, may serve to shew us likewise that the more impartial ancients of the time in which they were composed, if we should allow them to be pædobaptists, act more ingenuously than some moderns, and confess the words in dispute are to be understood in the antipædobaptist's sense, as appears beyond contradiction from these words: 'All ungodliness and impiety must be first removed, and the contrary principles of true holiness introduced, and so they must be baptized. For our Lord commanded, saying, *Teach first all nations*: and after that he adds, *And baptize them in the name*<sup>n</sup>,' &c. Whoever is the author of the Homilies ascribed to St. Clement, (perhaps it is the interpolator,) says exactly the same thing in these words, which are supposed to be spoken by St. Peter: '° When our Lord sent us to the ignorant Gentiles, to baptize them for the remission of sins, he commanded us first to teach them.'

Epiphanius too paraphrases the words thus: '*Teach all nations*; that is, convert and turn the nations from their corruptions to the truth<sup>p</sup>.' And to the same purpose St. Basil says, as he is translated by Mr. Wall himself, 'They must be first instructed, and then admitted to baptism<sup>q</sup>.' This author indeed speaks more fully here to this effect, than Mr. Wall has cited him.

The sense of the Latin Fathers in this case is evidently the same, from their translating the place constantly *docete, teach*. Tertullian in his treatise of Baptism reads the words, '*Go teach (docete) the nations*,' &c. To this he adds, John iii. 5, *Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, &c.* And from both concludes, that 'faith and the necessity of baptism are very closely joined together; therefore all who believed were baptized. So St. Paul when he believed was baptized<sup>r</sup>.' And a little after he says, 'First they were to preach, and after that to baptize<sup>s</sup>.' In another place, on

δυνάμει τοῦ Χριστοῦ φήσαντος αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, &c.

<sup>n</sup> Lib. vii. cap. 40. Οὕτω δεῖ καὶ ὑμᾶς πρότερον πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν ἐξελόντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, τότε τὴν εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῖς ἐγκαταβάλλεσθαι, καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀξιῶσαι. καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Κύριος ὑμῶν οὕτως ἡμῖν παρήνευσεν, εἰπὼν Μαθητεύσατε πρότερον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ τότε ἐπήγαγε τὸ, καὶ βαπτίσατε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

<sup>o</sup> Clementin. Hom. xvii. cap. 7. Εἰς τὰ αἰαθῇ ἔθνη ἀποστέλλων ἡμᾶς, βαπτίζειν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἕφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐνετεῖλατο ἡμῖν πρότερον διδάξαι αὐτοὺς.

<sup>p</sup> Epiph. advers. Hæres. lib. i. p. 50. Μαθητεύσατε τὰ ἔθνη, τουτέστι, μεταβάλλετε τὰ ἔθνη ἀπὸ κακίας εἰς ἀλήθειαν.

<sup>q</sup> De Baptismo, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 643 D. Δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταβιβῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος.

<sup>r</sup> Cap. xiii. *Itē, inquit, docete nationes, tingentes eas, &c.* Huic legi collata definitio illa: nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c. obstrinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem. Itaque omnes exinde credentes tinguebantur. Tunc et Paulus ubi credidit, tinctus est.

<sup>s</sup> Cap. xiv. Nam et prius est prædicare, posterius tinguere.

occasion of this commission, he says, ‘The apostles were appointed ‘doctors or teachers of the nations<sup>t</sup>.’ But nothing can be more clear than the following words of the same Father; when our Lord was ‘going to his Father after his resurrection, he commanded the ‘eleven to go and teach (*docere*) the nations, which were to be baptized in the name, &c. The apostles, therefore, (who, as their ‘name signifies, were sent,) having by the authority of the prophecy ‘in the Psalms elected Matthias by lot for a twelfth in Judas’ room, ‘and received the promised power of the Holy Spirit, to enable them ‘to work miracles and speak with tongues; first preached faith in ‘Christ, then constituted churches in Judæa; and afterwards went ‘out into all the world, and published the same faith among the ‘nations<sup>u</sup>.’

The confessor Clarus, bishop of Masecula in Numidia, referring to the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, says, ‘they after the apostles baptized the faith of believers;’ that is, they baptized, according to the commission and practice of the apostles, such as believed, upon the profession of their faith.

To these I will only add St. Hierome, and I have done with this head. He, commenting on the words of the commission, says, ‘The ‘order here observed is excellent: for he commands the apostles, ‘first to teach all nations, and after that to dip them with the sacrament of faith; and then to shew them how they must behave ‘themselves after their faith and baptism<sup>y</sup>.’ And Mr. Wall has transcribed words to the same effect from this place of St. Hierome, which he thus translates; ‘They first teach all the nations, then ‘when they are taught they baptize them with water; for it cannot be that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, ‘unless the soul have before received the true faith<sup>z</sup>.’ This passage, it seems, had been made use of against pædobaptism; and Mr. Wall undertakes to answer the argument raised from it, by insinuating

<sup>t</sup> Præscript. Hæretic. cap. viii. Nationibus destinati doctores apostoli, &c.

<sup>u</sup> Tertull. de Præscript. Hæretic. cap. xx. Undecim digrediens ad Patrem post resurrectionem, jussit ire et docere nationes, intinguendas in Patrem, &c. Statim igitur apostoli (quos hæc appellatio missos interpretatur) assumpto per sortem duodecimo Matthia in locum Judæ, ex auctoritate prophetiæ, quæ est in Psalmo David, consecuti promissam vim Spiritus Sancti ad virtutes et eloquium, primo per Judæam contestata fide in Jesum Christum, et ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejusdem

fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Cyprian. de Concil. Carthag. Suffrag. lxxix. ‘Credientium fidem baptizantes.’

<sup>y</sup> In Matth. xxviii. 19. Ordo præcipuus, jussit apostolos ut primum docerent universas gentes, deinde fidei intingerent sacramento, et post fidem ac baptismum quæ essent observanda præciperent.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. Primum docent omnes gentes, deinde doctas intingunt aqua: non enim potest fieri ut corpus recipiat baptismi sacramentum, nisi ante anima fidei susceperit veritatem.

that the commission, and the comment of St. Jerome, relate only to adult persons. But this is so far from lessening, that it rather adds to its strength; for if this commission does not relate to infant-baptism, and therefore not authorize it, the dispute is at an end, unless they can shew us some other that does command it; which all men know cannot be done.

4. Having proved our sense to be the same in which the Fathers of the primitive church always understood the commission; I am now, in the last place, to confirm it to be the true, by what is infinitely of more weight than anything urged before, I mean, by the authority or the sacred Scriptures themselves.

And here we might largely consider the history of the practice of the apostles in this matter; for they undoubtedly acted in perfect conformity to the directions and will of their great Master, and therefore their practice is justly accounted the best comment upon our Saviour's words and institutions. Now they, it is plain, (if the Scriptures give us a good account of the matter,) constantly taught first, and baptized afterwards; at least, it is on all hands allowed, they took this method with the Gentiles, to whom they were sent by this commission; by which it is evident how they to whom it was immediately given understood it, and that they thought it obliged them to proceed in that manner. And this precedaneous teaching and faith were necessary, not only to render the persons *willing* to be baptized, as some fancy, but likewise *fit* to receive the salutary grace; and therefore St. Philip<sup>a</sup>, even after the eunuch had discovered his willingness, and asked for baptism, requires a hearty faith, as a necessary condition even in persons ever so willing; *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized*; and not else, though you desire it ever so much.

But the instances of this kind are too numerous to be all repeated, and withal so very easy and obvious, that it is needless to do it: for all the passages in Scripture, which any way relate to the apostles' practice in the matter, are of this kind. Of St. Paul and Barnabas, when they came to Derbe, it is said, '*they had preached the Gospel to that city, and had taught many*'<sup>b</sup>. The word in the original, here rendered *taught*, is the same with that in the commission; which makes this passage the more considerable, in that it shews the practice of the apostles, and at the same time determines the sense of that Greek word to be as we contend.

But the parallel places to the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, put the sense of it beyond dispute: for St. Mark expresses it thus; *Go ye*

<sup>a</sup> Acts viii. 37.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xiv 21.

into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature<sup>c</sup>, &c. St. Luke, with reference to the same thing, says, *That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations*<sup>d</sup>. And St. Peter himself, who received the commission immediately from the mouth of our Lord, assures us this was his sacred meaning; for *He commanded us*, says he, *to preach unto the people*<sup>e</sup>, &c., all which sets the matter in the clearest light imaginable. And therefore, I think, I may safely conclude from the whole, that it is fully demonstrated to be one of the plainest things in the world that *μαθητεύω* signifies properly *to teach*, and that this is the sense of it particularly in the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19. And therefore our adversaries, when they cavil at this sense, do at best but trifle and contradict the constant use of the Greek word, and common sense of mankind; the unanimous agreement of the several versions, the joint authority of the primitive saints, the judgment of the most learned men, and the clear meaning and declarations of the spirit of God in the Holy Scriptures.

The argument I advanced then remains in its full force, and unanswered; namely, that since this commission empowers to baptize only such as it first commands to be taught, there is no warrant for baptizing infants contained in it; but on the contrary, infants are effectually excluded, such conditions being made necessary as they are not capable of. And therefore, well might I conclude as I did, that the Scriptures do not leave the matter so doubtful as our adversaries pretend. This very much alters the case from what Mr. Wall represents it to be; and shews his scheme is not well laid, so material an error being discovered in his very foundation.

I designed to have added some other considerations to the same purpose; but what I have insisted on at large, especially the sense of Matth. xxviii. 19, which is in itself so considerable a part of the dispute, and so essential to the determination of it, does plainly demonstrate that the Scriptures are not silent, but do sufficiently declare the baptism of infants to be no Divine institution, and that the commission to baptize was not intended to include infants, but purposely excludes them. Should our author therefore be able to prove ever so solidly that the Jews and primitive Christians did use to baptize their proselytes together with their infant children, we should notwithstanding have very good grounds to reject the practice. And this is the first thing I undertook to make out. What I have so largely and particularly said concerning some Greek words does,

<sup>c</sup> Mark xvi. 15.<sup>d</sup> Luke xxiv. 47.<sup>e</sup> Acts x. 42.



I confess, look like pedantry and affectation ; but the tenaciousness of our adversaries, who are not satisfied with a few instances, together with your commands, sir, are my excuse.

I am,  
Yours, &c.

## LETTER IX.

Mr. Wall's attempt founded on mistake—His pretences from the Jews examined ; which he has collected from the learned men who best understood their writings—Their authority of no weight ; the reasons they go upon being too weak—It is without sufficient ground that our author asserts, the Jews make it plain they baptized their proselytes before Christ's time—His authorities too late—Great alterations introduced in a short time—The passages produced by Mr. Wall do not so much as intimate that the Jews baptized proselytes in our Saviour's time—There is no necessity to understand the words in Mr. Wall's sense—The Jews used to baptize for the pollution contracted in circumcision, which may be the baptism spoken of in the Talmud—Some of the rabbins plainly shew us they neither knew nor allowed of any initiatory baptism—They ridicule our baptism as a fanciful ceremony, as appears from the ancient Nizzachon, which fixes the rise of the practice in Christ ; and mentions it as an initiation peculiar to Christians ; and opposes to it the Jewish circumcision only—It appears further from rabbi Isaac—So that the Jewish writings, if any thing, prove contrary to our author's opinion—The authority of the rabbins very insignificant, and never to be depended on—Their writings in general stuffed with very foolish romantic tales—Their fabulous and ridiculous way of accounting for Christ's power of miracles, from Toldoth Jeschu—More instances of their ridiculous whimsies, from the Talmud—Their foolish misapplication of Scripture—Their impious representations of God—A fabulous account of the origin of Rome—Another concerning R. Eliezer, in confirmation of their traditions—The Pirké of Eliezer—Another reason why the rabbins are not to be relied on is, that they profess to follow their doctors in all they assert, though ever so absurd—They prefer their Talmud and traditions before the Scriptures themselves—The character of the rabbins—Their excessive pride—Their way of interpreting the Scriptures—The Sanhedrim, though made up of their best men, consisted only of magicians, as themselves assert, &c.—They have endeavoured to corrupt the Scriptures—All learned men give the same character of the Jews and their writings—So Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Du Pin, Mr. Dodwell, Scaliger, Naclerus, Buxtorf, Lightfoot—And the same character is given of them by Christ himself too, who censures them more particularly on account of their washings—Their traditions were many and mischievous—All these things applied to the present dispute.

SIR,

IN my last I made it appear that Mr. Wall is guilty of an error in the very groundwork of his system, which of itself utterly subverts the whole. For what is built on an error, that is, on a nullity has no real foundation, and must sink of course ; and I hope to

satisfy you in the sequel, that every part of his scheme and all his arguments stand on the same foot, and are as ill supported. For to say the Jews did initiate their proselytes and their infants by baptism, and that the apostles and primitive church baptized the infants of believing parents, are mistakes; and the arguments brought to prove these two points are no better.

First, we will examine what our author says as to the practice of the Jews; and we shall soon see he comes very short of proving that they did in our Saviour's time, and before, initiate proselytes by baptism. His testimonies from the Jewish writings, he says, are taken from the most learned and judicious authors, who best understood that sort of learning: so that we may expect in Mr. Wall the united strength of our ablest adversaries all brought.

It is considerable, I confess, that so many learned men favour the opinion: but it will appear from the reasons they give for it that they were too credulous, and entertained it too easily; which lessens their authority very much. Mr. Wall intimates that he is not very capable of searching into the rabbinical writings himself: but he and all men are able to judge whether the arguments urged from them are sufficient to justify the pædobaptist doctrine.

Our author argues first from the Jews themselves; who, he says, make it 'fully to appear that the custom of the Jews before our Saviour's time was to baptize as well as circumcise any proselyte<sup>a</sup>,' &c. But this is too hastily affirmed. Several instances I know are and may be produced, which are express; but it does not therefore follow, that the matter must be so clear and evident: on the contrary, it seems a doubtful case at best, even from those very passages they cite, (if they are supposed to be the best,) whether this custom be so ancient as it is pretended; for though they plainly speak of their baptism, they do not prove it was practised in Christ's time, much less before it.

I think Mr. Wall cites only the two Talmuds, Maimonides, and Rabbi Solomon, to confirm his assertion. Now several of the greatest rabbins, as Serira Gaon, Jehuda Ben-Levi, the author of Meor Enajim, Abraham Ben-David, Rab. Minchas, Isaac Abravanel<sup>b</sup>, &c.; and from these the most learned Christian writers say, the ancientest part of the Talmud, namely that which is called the Mishna, was not compiled till about one hundred and fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem. Buxtorf says, 'The Jerusalem Talmud was compiled by Rab. Jochanan, two hundred and thirty years

<sup>a</sup> Introduction, p. 3. [2.]    <sup>b</sup> Vid. R. D. Ganz, in Tzemach David, ad an. 978. Mil-len. 4.

‘after Christ<sup>c</sup>’ but the Gemara, which is the far greatest part of the Babylonian Talmud, was not made till five hundred years after Christ, nor till three hundred and eleven after the Mishna, according to Abraham Ben-David and Ganz<sup>d</sup>. Maimonides lived not till above one thousand one hundred years after Christ. Their own chronologist places the birth of our Lord an. 3761<sup>e</sup>, and the time of Maimonides about 4927<sup>f</sup>, that is, one thousand one hundred and sixty-six years after; and Rabbi Solomon lived much about the same time; or according to Ganz<sup>g</sup>, but sixty years sooner.

Now, sir, can any reasonable man take the reports of authors who wrote so long after the times they speak of, for a sufficient proof of what was done so long before they were born? Had they cited any others who lived in, or so near the time of our Saviour, as to know what was then practised, the case would have been different, and we must have had recourse to the authors they mentioned: but since they have not done this, I think I may say Maimonides, though a great man, could know and relate what was done one thousand one hundred years before he was born, no better than any other man can now. And therefore such authorities in this case may justly be rejected: for every one knows how little men, who write at such a distance from the times they speak of, are to be depended on, any further than they produce some more ancient and authentic testimonies of one kind or other, in confirmation of what they say.

The Mishna, or text of the Talmud, though much the ancientest authority produced, is not wholly clear of this exception. And if the sense of the places transcribed be fairly represented, at most it carries the matter no higher than to one hundred and fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, (which happened anno Christi 70,) that is, two hundred and ten years after Christ. But will it follow, that because this book mentions the Jews baptizing their proselytes, therefore they used to do so above two hundred years before it was written? We are convinced by many examples what two hundred years can do in such cases. In the very case of baptism among ourselves in England, the manner of *dipping*, in about one quarter part of the time, was totally disused, and *sprinkling* substituted in its stead, and urged as the most suitable way, and as lawful as the other which was more ancient; and all this not only *without*, as Dr. Whitby notes, but likewise *contrary* to, the allowance of the Institution, the approbation of the established church, and that express determination of the council held under Kenwolfe, which I mentioned

<sup>c</sup> Abbreviatur. p. 242.

<sup>d</sup> Tzemach David, ad an. 260. Millen. 5.

<sup>e</sup> Ganz, Tzemach David, lib. ii. <sup>f</sup> Ibid. lib. i. <sup>g</sup> Tzemach David, lib. i. ad an. 4865.

before<sup>h</sup>. And where is the necessity to suppose the fanciful Jews more constant and uniform in religious matters, than ourselves? Their frequent and sudden relapses into idolatry under their judges and kings are instances of a different temper.

But not to insist upon this: the passages cited by Mr. Wall are so far from proving, that not one of them does so much as assert or intimate, that the baptism of proselytes was in use in our Saviour's time: how then could he pretend it was so plain a case? The first citation he reads thus: 'When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised; and when he is circumcised, they baptize him in the presence of two wise men,' &c. But what of this? It shews indeed what was the method when this was written; but from what words is it to be collected, that the same custom had been observed for two hundred years before? which was the thing to be proved.

Besides, there is no necessity to understand the words in Mr. Wall's sense: and if it should be argued that they do not speak of an initiatory baptism, but only a purification from the blood of circumcision, with which the patient is supposed to be defiled; I do not see which way our author would be able to defend his construction. The commentaries on the Mishna, which are considerably later, perhaps may be allowed in some measure to favour our author; but the Mishna itself may very well mean another thing. For, as Maimonides notes, 'the style of it is short, and capable of diverse senses<sup>i</sup>.' That the Jews, on account of several kinds of pollution, used to purify themselves by washing, cannot be questioned; the *diverse washings* mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews<sup>k</sup> make it incontestable. And it is plain enough, that upon some such notion they were washed after the sore of circumcision was healed, as are also the Mahometans<sup>l</sup> to this day from them. And this pollution seems to have been contracted from the blood of circumcision; for thus the Chaldee paraphrase, which goes under the name of Jonathan's, interprets the words Ezek. xvi. 6. of the blood of circumcision, from which ver. 9, God says, he washed and cleansed them: and the Jews in their second benediction<sup>m</sup> after circumcision apply the words in the same manner. And therefore it is observable, even all natural-born Jews were washed with this baptism, except only females, as Dr. Hyde<sup>n</sup> likewise notes, who not being circumcised, were not washed till they

<sup>h</sup> Page 138.

<sup>i</sup> Porta Mosis, p. 78, 79.

<sup>k</sup> Chap. ix. 10.

<sup>l</sup> Bobovius de Turcarum Liturgia, p. 23.

et Compend. Theol. Moham. per Reland.

P. 59.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Buxtorf. Synag. Judaic. p. 100.

<sup>n</sup> In Not. 39. ad Bobov. Tract. p. 22. a.



had contracted pollution some other way: and this plainly intimates that there was a baptism thought necessary on account of circumcision, or some pollution contracted thereby; otherwise persons who had been circumcised would not have been obliged to a baptism, from which others who could not be circumcised were excused.

Why then may not the Talmud be understood to mean only this washing for pollution by circumcision? This was to be done as soon as the cure of the sore was accomplished, and so was that spoken of in the Talmud; they are the same therefore in respect to time, and I do not understand how a person could be washed with two different washings at one and the same time.

Further, the antiquity, &c. of the practice is rendered dubious by the disagreement of the rabbins. Some plainly assert it; and others as plainly intimate they neither knew nor allowed of such an initiatory ceremony. There is no need to be large in the proof of this; and therefore I shall instance but in one author or two.

They who have read their writings against the Christians must have observed they ridicule the sacrament of baptism as an unaccountable and fanciful ceremony. The anonymous author of the ancientest Nizzachon frequently touches upon it with his usual gall, and would expose it as very absurd and foolish; which to me is a clear argument he did not apprehend that our baptism was borrowed from the Jews: nay, he argues against it in one place, where he says, 'It is nowhere commanded to plunge persons or proselytes into the water. Why therefore does Jesus command to do so?' The author must needs be understood to speak here of the baptism of proselytes: for he could not have said in general of all other baptisms, 'they are nowhere commanded.' In another place, attempting to shew the insignificaney and uselessness of our sacred institution, he says, 'From what sin or uncleanness does this baptism purify? What sin or pollution is there in infant children, that ye baptize them?' His opposing our baptism so eagerly must import they had no such thing in use among them. The whole page indeed is to our purpose, but there are two or three words I cannot well pass by: the rabbin had said, that Christians ought to be circumcised in imitation of Christ and the apostles, as well as baptized in imitation of them; to which, in the name of the Christians, he makes this objection, 'That Christ came to renew the law, and that he had laid

o Pag. 53. אבל להשליך בן אדם במים לא נכתב מצולם כי למה זה היה לו לצוות לישו שבילה זו.

p Ibid. pag. 192. שמץ שבילתם מה חטא וטומאה דוחה: וכי ילך קטן שהם טובלים.

‘aside or abolished circumcision, but instituted baptism<sup>q</sup>.’ The rabbin’s blasphemous answer to this shall not be repeated, as making nothing to the point: only we may observe, the objection places the rise and validity of baptism in Christ’s institution; and the Jew does not, in contradiction, say it was borrowed from them; or that, since it had been a practice under their dispensation, there was as much reason to abolish that as circumcision, or the like: for a cavilling, quarrelsome Jew might have said a hundred such idle things on this occasion, if he had understood that Christ adopted the ceremony from them.

Perhaps some may think these citations from the ancient Nizzachon do not prove, that the author of it knew of no such baptism among the Jews as he found practised by the Christians; therefore I will add, that he expressly fixes the rise of the practice in Christ and St. John his forerunner; for he makes these trifling reflections on John’s baptism, and the words in Matth. iii. 5, 6. ‘But what signified all this? Who gave John power and authority to institute this baptism? Upon what law could he ground the fancy? neither on the old nor the new<sup>r</sup>.’ Had it been a custom among themselves, it would have been easy to see from whence St. John derived it; and the rabbin would not have failed to put us in mind how much we were beholden to them for the substantial ceremonies of our religion; and that we copied our rite of initiation from their traditions.

In another place, upon the story of the young man who asked our Lord, what he must do to inherit eternal life, Mark x. 17, &c., this same writer observes, that Christ ‘does not command him to be baptized<sup>s</sup>,’ nor take any notice of that novel invention, ‘but only inculcates to him the old commandments.’ By which opposition of old commandments to baptism, he plainly signifies, that he took the baptism of Christ to be a new institution of his own, and something singular too, or at least not used by themselves; else he would not have been so much disturbed at it, and argued against it so frequently. He mentions baptism also as the initiation peculiar to Christians, and opposes to it circumcision only, as the initiation of proselytes to Judaism. The passage is longer than I am willing to transcribe, and therefore I refer you to the book itself<sup>t</sup>.

The sense however is much the same with what rabbi Isaac has expressed in these words; ‘They have abrogated circumcision, and

<sup>q</sup> Id. Ibid. ישו בא וחידש את התורה ועזב את המילה וציוה הטבילה.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. pag. 195. וכל כך למה למי ציוה ליוחנן לעשות זאת הטבילה? באיזה תורה

מצאה לא בקדמונית ולא בהדשה. לא אמר לך ועשה טבילה.

<sup>s</sup> Pag. 221. אלא מצוות קדמוניות ציוה לו.

<sup>t</sup> Page 242, 243, and 251.

‘substituted baptism in its stead; as they have likewise done with the sabbath, instead of which they observe the first day of the week<sup>u</sup>.’

This is exceeding plain; for as they kept a new day instead of the ancient one, so he says they have ‘in like manner’ substituted a new ceremony of initiation instead of the old one: nay, in the very next words he complains, the Christians ‘have abolished the whole law, and all the divine precepts which the law makes necessary, except only some things in relation to incest,’ &c. Here he enumerates some of the moral precepts, but does not mention baptism at all; which therefore I argue was, in this author’s judgment, no institution of Moses, nor practised by the Jews before Christ; because he asserts the Christians had abolished all rites besides those excepted, in the number of which he has not placed baptism.

And when some Christians had objected to the Jews, that they only circumcised the males, without using any initiatory ceremony for females, whereas the Christians by baptism initiate both sexes: if the Jews had used baptism, they might have replied, they did as much as the Christians: and yet the author of *Nizzachon*<sup>x</sup> does not make the least mention of it, but turns off the objection another way.

What has been said makes it, I think, very clear,

1. That the passages Mr. Wall cites from the text of the Talmud may only speak of baptism for purification, and not of baptism for proselytes.

2. That none of the Jewish writings, produced by him, do assert or imply, that proselytes were in, or so much as near Christ’s time, usually initiated by baptism; which however was what our author should have proved: but on the contrary,

3. Some of the rabbins manifestly speak of that Christian ceremony as an invention of St. John and our Saviour; and affirm it expressly to be altogether new, and not grounded upon any law. From all which I may safely conclude, that the said Jewish writings are very far from proving what our author, and the gentlemen he transcribes, have undertaken to establish. For, in short, if any thing is to be collected from them, it is the contrary to that opinion: none of them say, as our author does, that the Jews ‘before and in our Saviour’s time,’ used to baptize their proselytes;

<sup>u</sup> Chissuk Emunah, pag. 401. בשלו מצות מילה וקבעו שמר תחתיה וכן בשלו שבת יום השבת ושבתים תחתיו ביום הראשון וכן בשלו כלל המצות

וזה קצת מן העריות שנוהרין &c.  
[This treatise is subjoined to the Nizzachon quoted above.]

<sup>x</sup> Page 251. med.

but some, as I have shewn you, directly assert that this initiatory ceremony was not practised till St. John's and Christ's appearance, whom they make to be the first authors of it : so that it could not be borrowed from the Jews. And as for any later practices of this bewildered people, they can be of no use to illustrate our Lord's design in the institution. And indeed, it is at best a very odd attempt, to put so violent an interpretation on our Lord's words, merely from the authority of the rabbins.

But in answer to Mr. Wall's arguing from the Jewish writings, I have this further to say ; that if the rabbins had universally asserted in so many words, that ' the Jews always did use to initiate their ' proselytes by baptism ;' and that ' St. John and Jesus Christ ' borrowed the ceremony from them ;' I should nevertheless think it the greatest folly and madness in the world to believe it on their sole authority. All who are acquainted with the Jews know it is not without very good reason that I say this ; for they are a despicable, ignorant, and whimsical sort of writers, whose credit is at the lowest ebb imaginable.

Though this character of them is notorious enough ; yet because our adversaries mention the rabbins so much in this dispute, and Dr. Hammondy calls their authority, (not over-prudently,) ' the true ' basis of infant-baptism ;' I think myself obliged to confirm what I here advance ; being under a kind of promise likewise to assign some of the reasons which prove the rabbins and their writings are of no weight, and that their testimony cannot be relied on by any who love the truth, and take a prudent care not to be imposed on in their search after it.

1. In pursuance of this, sir, I will first give you a taste of their writings, whereby you may judge what romantic authors they are. All their books, and almost every page in them, are so full of passages which demonstrate this, that I am at a loss where to begin, and what to single out ; for to mention all of this kind, it would be to transcribe their whole books : but I will only present a specimen, which shall convince you what gallimaufries make up their compositions. That detestable libel, entitled *Toldoth Jeschu*, is filled with nothing else but the grossest falsehoods and blasphemies, and all asserted with as much assurance, and under such pretences of seriousness and honesty, as if they were certain truths. It would be criminal barely to repeat words so extravagantly impious, wherewith they slanderously abuse and affront the Lord of life ; and therefore if you desire to know more particularly what that base author writes, I refer you



to the book itself, rather than blot my paper with the repetition of many things it contains.

Some however of the less shocking I will venture to mention : the many and prodigious miracles our Lord wrought were too apparent and certain to be denied ; and therefore these authors would, with their fathers, evade the force of them, by attributing them to enchantments, and the power of devils. The relation is very long ; however I will begin it, because it may shew what heed is to be given to their traditions ; and what reason Christians have to regard those writers, who can thus traduce the most innocent and unspotted life that ever was in history, and obstinately disown the most apparent operations of a divine power. ‘ David, the king,’ they say, ‘ in digging the foundation, found a stone laid over the mouth of a pit, on which was inscribed the proper name of God : this he caused to be taken up, and placed in the holy of holies. And the wise men, fearing lest some over-curious young men might learn this name, and by the power of it cause great disturbances in the world, made, by their magic art, two brasen lions, which they set at the door of the holy of holies, one on the right hand, and the other on the left ; that if any should enter in, and learn this secret name, the lions, as he came out again, should, by roaring, strike him with such terror and confusion, as to cause him entirely to forget the name he had learned. Now the rumour being spread, that Jesus, &c.——he left the upper Galilee, and came privately to Jerusalem, and entering into the temple, learned the holy letters, and writ the incomprehensible name on a parchment ; and first uttering the name as a charm that he might not feel any pain, he cut a gash in his flesh, and put into it the parchment which contained the mysterious name ; and then immediately pronouncing the name again, the flesh was perfectly healed up as at first.——As he came out, the brasen lions set up their roar, and frightened the name quite out of his mind. Upon which, he went immediately without the city ; and, opening the flesh, took out the hidden parchment, and by these means again learned the powerful name. After this, he went into Bethlehem of Judæa, the place of his nativity, and began to cry with a loud voice, and say, &c., I am born of a pure virgin, &c. I am the Son of God, and the prophet Esaias prophesied of me, saying, *Behold a virgin shall conceive, &c.* I made even myself ; and the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all things, were made by me. Upon this, some ask him, saying, Shew us by some sign or wonder that thou art God. To whom he answered, saying, Bring hither a dead body, and I will raise it to life. With

‘ that, they fell to digging up a grave with all expedition ; and  
 ‘ finding nothing but dry bones, they told him, We have found here  
 ‘ only the bones. Well, bring them here into the midst, says he.  
 ‘ And when they had brought them, he fitted every bone to its  
 ‘ place, covered them with skin and flesh and nerves ; and the body  
 ‘ became alive, and arose, and stood on its feet : and the whole com-  
 ‘ pany saw the wonder, and was amazed.——Bring hither a leper,  
 ‘ says he, and I will heal him. And when they had brought one to  
 ‘ him, he in like manner healed him by the incomprehensible name :  
 ‘ which when they that were with him saw, they fell down before  
 ‘ him, and worshipped him, saying, *Thou art indeed the Son of God.*’

With what amazing impudence and blasphemy is this absurd fable related ! The whole libel is of a piece with this, and a remarkable instance of rabbinical honesty and good sense ; which should never be forgotten. The same libel continues thus :

‘ One of the wise men proposed to the rest, if it may be thought  
 ‘ fit, let one of us also learn the name, and thereby be enabled to do  
 ‘ these wonders as well as he, and perhaps by these means we may  
 ‘ take him. The sanhedrim approved of the advice, and decreed,  
 ‘ that whosoever should learn the name, and thereby discover and  
 ‘ expose Jesus, he should receive a double reward in the other world.  
 ‘ Then one of the wise men, whose name was Judas, stood up, and  
 ‘ said, I will learn it.’——And then they add the following story :  
 ‘ Jesus said, Does not Esaias prophesy of me ? and my great fore-  
 ‘ father David likewise says of me, *The Lord said unto my Lord, &c.* ;  
 ‘ and again, *Thou art my Son, this day &c.* And now I will ascend  
 ‘ to my Father who is in heaven, and I will sit at his right hand ;  
 ‘ and this I will do before your faces ; but thou, Judas, shalt never  
 ‘ come there. Then Jesus immediately pronouncing the mighty  
 ‘ name, a sudden wind arose and carried him into the air, where he  
 ‘ remained between heaven and earth. Judas in like manner pro-  
 ‘ nouncing the name, was also carried up, and so they both flew  
 ‘ about in the air, to the great amazement of all the spectators. But  
 ‘ Judas, again pronouncing the name, falls on Jesus, designing to  
 ‘ cast him down headlong ; while Jesus also pronouncing the name,  
 ‘ endeavoured to cast down Judas, and thus they continued strug-  
 ‘ gling together. But when Judas saw he could not prevail against  
 ‘ Jesus, he urined, and sprinkled it upon him ; by which being  
 ‘ rendered unclean, they both fell down to the earth together, and  
 ‘ were deprived of the power of the incomprehensible name, till  
 ‘ they had washed themselves.’

If you please, you may see more still of their nonsense, and

intolerable blasphemous reflections on the blessed Jesus, collected by Vorstius in his observations on D. Ganz's Chronology, at p. 257, &c.

Though these writers do not always vomit out the same malice as when they treat this subject, yet they ever fall into the same deliriums of a rambling fancy, and scorn to be confined, so much as even to probability and decorum. I will make out this even from their Talmud itself, for which they have all so great a veneration. It is a medley, a hotchpotch of the most ridiculous and senseless fictions, and a vast collection of fooleries; and you will see I do not wrong it, when you look over the following instances.

‘As the wise men were once sitting in the gate, two lads passed by them; one, according to the custom, kept his head covered, but the other uncovered his head. Of him that had uncovered his head, R. Eliezer said, he was a bastard. R. Joshua said, he was the son of a woman set apart for uncleanness. But R. Akiba said, he was both a bastard and the son of an unclean woman. The rest of the wise men say to R. Akiba, How comes it to pass, that you contradict your companions? He answered, I will confirm what I have said, and presently goes to the mother of the lad, whom he found in the market selling pulse; he says to her, Daughter, if you will satisfy me in the thing I shall ask you, I will make you to enter into eternal life<sup>z</sup>. Says she, Swear to me. Whereupon R. Akiba did swear with his lips, but not in his heart<sup>a</sup>,’ &c. And after this, he put the question to her, which she answered, proving the person to be illegitimate, &c.

Such tales as these, which the greatest rabbins so gravely employ themselves in, would not pass with old women and children in a winter evening. Besides, you may observe their integrity here; R. Akiba is represented swearing falsely, in contempt of the Decalogue, though at other times he is called *the glory of the law*<sup>b</sup>, and was so nicely conscientious of keeping the tradition of the elders, that when he was in prison, and wanted water to drink, he chose rather to wash his hands with what he had, than drink it to satisfy his thirst, saying, ‘I had better die with thirst, than transgress the traditions of the elders<sup>c</sup>.’ And yet this zealot made nothing of perjury; which is all one as to say, the traditions of the elders are more to be regarded than the law of God.

And what arrogance and blasphemy is it for the vile wretch to assume to himself the power of admitting into heaven, and distri-

<sup>y</sup> Massechet Challa.

<sup>z</sup> אני מביאך להי עולם

<sup>a</sup> ושבוע בשפתיו ומבטל בלבו

<sup>b</sup> Sota. כבוד התורה

<sup>c</sup> Joma. לא אעבור על דעת הברין

buting rewards there, when this, we know, is solely the prerogative of the Eternal King! and blessed be his name that it is so!

The Talmudical treatise they call *Sanhedrim* has the following insipid passage: ‘Our rabbins tell us, that Jesus had five disciples, ‘Mathai, Nakai, Nezer, Boni, and Thoda. When Mathai was ‘brought into court, he argued, Should Mathai be put to death, ‘seeing it is written (מתי Mathai), *When shall I come and appear ‘before God?* But they answered him, Ought not Mathai to die, ‘when it is written (מתי Mathai), *When shall he die, and his name ‘perish?*

‘Afterwards they brought in Nakai, and he pleaded, Shall Nakai ‘be put to death, though it be written, *The innocent* (i. e. נקי) *and ‘righteous slay thou not?* But they answered him, Should not Nakai ‘die, when it is said, *In the secret places doth he murder the innocent?* ‘(נקי).

‘After him they brought in Nezer, who said, Shall Nezer be put ‘to death, when it is written (נצר Nezer), *A branch shall grow out ‘of his roots?* To whom they answered, Shall not Nezer be put to ‘death, seeing it is written, *Thou art cast out of thy grave like an ‘abominable branch?*’ (i. e. in Hebrew, נצר Nezer).

‘Next they brought Boni, and he argued, Shall Boni die, when ‘it is said, *Israel is my son* (בני), *my firstborn?* But they answered, ‘Shall not Boni die, when it is written, *I will slay thy son* (בנך), ‘*even thy firstborn.*

‘Last of all they bring Thoda, who pleaded, Shall Thoda be put ‘to death, when it is written, *A psalm of praise* (לתודה)? To ‘which they answered, Shall not Thoda be put to death, seeing it is ‘written, *Whoso offers praise* (or לתודה) *glorifies me?*’

In one place the Talmud says, ‘There are three watches in the ‘night; in every one of which the holy and ever-blessed One roars ‘out for grief like a lion, and says, Woe is me that I have made ‘desolate my house, and burnt my temple, and that I have made ‘my children captive to the heathen<sup>d</sup>!’ Surely none but madmen would dare to make such grossly wicked representations of the infinite majesty of God.

In the said tract the great God is a little after described howling in the same manner again: sometimes he is represented praying; sometimes weeping, &c. in this one book called *Berachoth*, which treats of prayer and thanksgiving. And for an essay of their philo-

<sup>d</sup> Berachoth, fol. 3. a. את ביתי ושרפתי את היכלי והגלית את · שלש משמרות · חוי הלילה ועל כל משמר ומשמר יושב בני לבין אומות העולם. הקבה ושואג כארי ואומר אוי שהחרבתי



sophy and divinity, let this suffice: 'When God calls to mind the troubles of his children among the Gentiles, it makes him drop two tears into the ocean, the sound of which is heard from one end of the world to the other; and this is the cause of earthquakes<sup>e</sup>.'

I will transcribe one passage more concerning God's weeping, though it be pretty long, and very foolish: but it shews how gross the understandings of these men are. 'Just as the enemies went into the sanctuary, and burnt it with fire, the blessed God said, Now I shall have no habitation upon earth, &c.——Then God mourned and lamented, saying, Woe is me! what have I done? I did suffer my Schechina to dwell in the world, because of the Jews; but now they have sinned, and I am returned to my ancient habitation, I shall become the scorn of the nations, &c.——While he was breathing out his complaints, Metatron came, and prostrating himself on his face, cried, O thou Lord of the whole world, I will lament and mourn; but weep not thou. To whom the ever-blessed God made answer, If thou dost not allow me to weep here, I will give myself wholly up to my grief.——God came down; his holy angels and Jeremiah the prophet going before him: when he came to his temple, he said, This doubtless is my house, into which my enemies have entered, and have done what they pleased. Then he began to grieve and lament: Woe is me, that my house is destroyed! O my children! where are you? O my priests! where are you? O my friends! where are you? What shall I do for you? I warned you, but you would not repent. Then turning to Jeremiah, he said<sup>f</sup>, &c.

I believe you are sufficiently tired with this stuff; but I must desire you to read one example or two more, from the great abundance of which the Talmud and Commentaries, &c. are made up. 'God kissed our master Moses on the mouth; and when he perceived it took away his breath, and that he was dead, he fell a weeping<sup>g</sup>.' The foundation and origin of Rome is thus storied in the Talmud; 'At that time when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, the angel Gabriel descended and fixed a reed in the sea, which drew up the mud, upon which was built that great city Rome<sup>h</sup>.' This fable is more at large set down in the Midrash Rabba Cantic. ch. i. ver. 6. Buxtorf has translated the place in his Talmudical Lexicon,

<sup>e</sup> Berachoth, 61. a. בשעה שהקבה וזכר את בניו ששרויים בצער בין אומות העולם מוריד שתי דמעות לים הגדול וקולם נשמש מסוף העולם ועד סופו והיו גוהא.

<sup>f</sup> In Echa Rabbati, fol. 55 b.

<sup>g</sup> Midrash, Debarim Rabba, prope fin.

נשקו הקבה [למשה רבינו] ונסל נשמתו בנשיקת פה והיה הקבה בוכה.

<sup>h</sup> Sanhedrim, fol. 21 b. בשעה שנשא שלמה את בת פרעה ירד גבריאל ונעץ קנה בים והעלה שירטון ועליו נבנה כרך גדול שרומי.

at the word רור, where he has also collected several other passages which relate to this matter, from the Talmuds and Midrasehim : all which does most abundantly shew the great ignorance of these whimsical historians ; and that they are no more to be relied on than the Popish Legends and Lives of their Saints.

Among other things which I am unwilling to pass by, is that strange story of R. Eliezer, which I will endeavour to abbreviate what I can. After Eliezer had done several strange things to prove the true tradition was in him, it follows, ‘ If I am possessed of the ‘ tradition,’ says he, ‘ let the neighbouring river testify it. And immediately the river turned its current the contrary way<sup>i</sup>.’ But his adversaries not being satisfied with this, he says again : ‘ If I hold ‘ the truth, then let the walls of this school bear witness of it : and ‘ immediately the walls began to lean as if they would fall. Upon ‘ which R. Joshua cried out, and said to the walls, If the disciples ‘ of the wise men dispute among themselves concerning tradition, ‘ what is that to you, that you begin to move ? At this, in respect ‘ to Joshua, the walls were withheld from falling quite down : and ‘ in honour to Eliezer they remain leaning to this day.——R. Nathan, by chance, met with Elias, and asked him what God did at ‘ that time, when the rabbins were so hotly engaged concerning tradition ? Elias answered, Why truly, he laughed, and said, My ‘ children have conquered me, my children have conquered me,’ &c. Thus they approve themselves to be what our Saviour calls them, *blind guides who lead the blind*, &c.

The magnified Pirké of R. Eliezer, which are adorned with the highest encomiums of *divine*, *holy*, &c., are in like manner nothing else but a collection of the same kind of ridiculous senseless stories as those which compose the Talmud. In one place, for instance, reckoning up seven miraculous things, the fourth is this : ‘ That from ‘ the creation, no man had ever been sick, but men were taken with ‘ a sudden sneezing, and so sneezed out their souls at their noses, ‘ till our father Jacob<sup>k</sup>,’ &c. : and so all the rest of that admired treatise is nothing else but such like silly whimsies, raked together without any judgment or design.

Another thing I would observe to you, in order to shew how little the rabbins are to be trusted in any thing they say, is the great respect and veneration they express for their whimsical doctors, and all their traditions, which they publicly profess to follow, let them be ever so absurd. Thus R. Solomon Jarchi, on Deut. xvii. 11, determines that the wise men must be submitted to, even ‘ though

<sup>i</sup> Bava Metzia, fol. 59 a.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. 52.

‘ they should say the right hand is the left, and the left the right<sup>l</sup>;’ and therefore it is a law in the Talmud, that ‘ whosoever refuses to ‘ obey the wise men shall be put to death<sup>m</sup>.’ And the great Akiba, as it is noted above, was so zealous for this, that he chose rather to die of thirst, than not wash his hands according to the traditions of the elders, with that small portion of water which was allowed him in prison. And in the same place there is this sentence: ‘ Whosoever despises the words of the wise men shall be cast into hell<sup>n</sup>;’ for according to R. Ezechiah, an author of great use and authority among the Jews, ‘ he that contradicts his teacher, does as bad as if ‘ he contradicted God himself<sup>o</sup>.’

Nor are they content with all this, but carry the matter to a more impious extreme, and even prefer the Talmud and the impertinences of their doctors before the Scriptures themselves. Therefore they compare the text of the Bible to water, but the text of the Talmud to wine<sup>p</sup>; intimating the Mischna does as much excel the Scriptures, as wine does water. And accordingly R. Schem Tof asserts, that ‘ nothing is greater than the most holy Talmud<sup>q</sup>.’ And the Talmudists have the vanity (or impudence shall I say?) to assert that even ‘ God himself, of the twelve hours of the day, spends three in ‘ the study of the law, and all the other nine in studying the Talmud<sup>r</sup>.’ To such an extravagant degree of phrensy and pride are these wise men arrived.

From the whole it appears, that the Talmud, &c. of the Jews are a sort of writings full of senseless, scandalous falsehoods, and therefore can be of no credit or authority at all.

2. In the second place it may not be amiss to say some things relating to the character of these rabbins.

From what I have already said, it is plain they have always been exceeding bigotted to their wise men, their Scribes and Pharisees; especially the members of their Sanhedrim, whose assertions they are ever ready to submit to with entire resignation and blind obedience; which has prepared them to receive the grossest absurdities and falsehoods, and to swallow all the dreams of the rabbins for unexceptionable truth and matter of fact.

And to this may be added their excessive pride and arrogance, for they think nobody has any sense but themselves. Thus R. Schimeon

<sup>l</sup> אפילו אומר לך על ימין שהוא שמאל ויעל שמאל שהוא ימין.

<sup>m</sup> Tractat. Erubim. fol. 21 b. כל העובר על דברי סופרים חייב מיתה.

<sup>n</sup> Erubim, fol. 21 b. שכל המלעיג על דברי חכמים נידון בצואה רותחת.

<sup>o</sup> In Chaskuni, fol. 94 b. החולק על השכינה רבו כחולק על השכינה.

<sup>p</sup> Tract. Sopherim, cap. 15.

<sup>q</sup> Mizbeach Hazzahab, cap. 5. התלמוד המקדש אין למעלה ממנו.

<sup>r</sup> Tract. Schabbath.

says, 'There are but few wise men; if there are two, it must be I 'and my sons.' Maimonides, without naming the place indeed, cites this from the Talmud<sup>t</sup>, Tract. Succah. fol. 45 b.

They were likewise much given to their cabalistical art, and that part of it they called *Gematria*, whereby they made words signify the same as any others they pleased to name, if the letters of one did but make the same number with the letters of the other; and they thought there was no need of any arguments but this numerical likeness to confirm the sense they gave a word; so because Gen. xi. 1. it is said the whole earth was of *one language*, in Hebrew, שפה אחת, which letters make the number 794, which by some mistake was taken to be the number of לשון הקודש<sup>u</sup> also; hence they would infer that the text means that the whole earth spoke at that time the *holy language*, as it is called, viz. the Hebrew. And when Ahasuerus says to Haman, Esth. iii. 11, *The silver is given thee, the people also, to do with them as it seemeth good to thee*; by the *silver* they understand the king threatened him with the gallows he was afterwards hanged on, because כסף makes just the same number as צע, viz. 160; and by the same rule not a passage in Scripture but may be made to say any thing, and indeed a thousand different things together.

The Sanhedrim, which was composed of their greatest and best men, consisted of a parcel of magicians and fortunetellers or conjurers; for the Talmud itself says expressly that a man is not received into that 'august assembly,' unless he be 'well skilled in the black art, 'and speaks seventy languages<sup>x</sup>, &c.; a glorious qualification indeed for directors in religion!

Another charge I would lay against them is, their corrupting and altering the sacred Scriptures themselves, out of which they have attempted to erase some passages that did not please them. I will but just give a quotation from St. Justin Martyr to this purpose; in his dispute with Trypho the Jew, he says thus: 'All those places 'of Scripture, which are manifestly contrary to their senseless conceits, they would evade by denying they are so written<sup>y</sup>.' And again a little after, 'As for your rabbins, I have no credit for them, 'who have the confidence to reject the translation made by the 'seventy elders under Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, and

<sup>s</sup> ראיתי בני עליה והם מוציאי מא משנים  
הם אני ובני הם.

<sup>t</sup> Porta Mosis, p. 104.

<sup>u</sup> Chaskuni, ad Gen. xi. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Menacoth, fol. 65 a. בעלי כשפים  
ויודעים שבנים לשון.

<sup>y</sup> Pag. 294 B. \*A γὰρ ἂν διαρρήδην ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς φαίνονται ἐλέγχοντα αὐτῶν τὴν ἀνόητον καὶ φίλαυτον γνώμην, ταῦτα τολμῶσι λέγειν μὴ οὕτω γεγράφηαι. [Sect. 68.]



‘ set themselves up for interpreters. And I would have you understand, that they have wholly taken out and disown many passages of Scripture which are in this translation, from whence it is plainly proved to have been foretold, that this crucified person was both God and man, and that he should be crucified and put to death<sup>z</sup>.’

Amongst other places thus perfidiously obliterated by them, he instances in Jer. xi. 19, *But I was like a lamb*, &c., which verse however he remarks was then remaining in some copies in their synagogues, and had been then but lately struck out of any; and I think it is in all the Hebrew copies, and other translations now extant, as well as in that of the Seventy.

3. I am sensible I have treated the rabbins pretty roughly; but am satisfied all I have said of them is exactly true: and since without blushing they offer such broad affronts to the common sense of all mankind, and venture to treat the divine Majesty both in the person of the Father and of the Son so blasphemously, they deserve no favour.

Besides, I am justified in this by the judgment and practice of all learned men.

Mr. Le Clerc, in this present case in dispute, expresses the doubtfulness and insufficiency of the authority of the rabbins, by saying, ‘ The Jews, if we may venture to believe the rabbins, received no proselytes but by baptism<sup>a</sup>,’ &c. More generally in another place he says, ‘ The Jews seem to claim the privilege of cashiering their reason, and advance without any shame all the foolish whimsies in the world and would yet pass for men of very good sense<sup>b</sup>.’ And to the same purpose he frequently speaks on other occasions.

Mons. du Pin, when he would give a treatise he is speaking of, the worst character he can, says, ‘ It was writ by somebody who was wholly besotted with the dreaming enthusiasms of the rabbins and cabalists<sup>c</sup>.’ Mr. Dodwell, speaking of the use of the Jewish writings, says, ‘ Considering the fabulousness and suspiciousness of these rabbinical records in any thing historical, I should be much better satisfied with any information from those more certainly ancient

<sup>z</sup> Pag. 297 B. ‘ Ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ τοῖς διδασκαλοῖς ὑμῶν πείθονται, μὴ συντεθειμένοις καλῶς ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Αἰγυπτίων γενομένῳ βασιλεῖ ἐβδομήκοντα πρεσβυτέρων. Ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγεῖσθαι πειρῶνται’ καὶ ὅτι πολλὰς γραφὰς τέλεον περιέειλον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξηγησέων τῶν γεγεννημένων ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ γεγεννημένων πρεσβυτέρων, ἐξ ὧν διαρρήδην οὗτος αὐτὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς, ὅτι Θεὸς, καὶ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ σταυρούμενος, καὶ ἀποθνήσκων κεκρυμμένος ἀπο-

δείκνυνται εἰδέναι, ὑμᾶς βούλομαι. [Sect. 71.]

<sup>a</sup> In Not. Gall. ad Matth. iii. 6. Les Juifs, si nous en croyons les rabbins, ne recevoient, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Bibliothèque Choisie, tom. xiii. p. 405. C’est là un privilège des Juifs, de ne faire presque aucun usage de leur raison, de débiter, sans honte, toutes sortes de rêveries, et de passer néanmoins pour habiles gens.

<sup>c</sup> Hist. Eccles. vol. i. p. 155 b.

‘ authors, which are extant in other tongues, such as Philo and Josephus, &c., and indeed shall not credit the rabbins any further than as they agree with such better attested monuments, or with the nature of things attested by them<sup>d</sup>.’

Scaliger says of R. Ascher, who dwelt then at Amsterdam, that ‘ he was an ingenious man for a Jew<sup>e</sup>.’ And a little after, ‘ It is very seldom that a Jew who turns Christian is good for any thing; they are always bad<sup>f</sup>.’ Naclerus says of the Talmud that ‘ though it be full of the most palpable lies, and contrary to all the laws of God, the Scriptures, and the light of nature, yet it is enjoined under pain of death that no one presume to deny any one thing written therein<sup>g</sup>.’

I have the testimony also of two unexceptionable judges in this matter; I mean the great Buxtorf, and our own incomparable Lightfoot; than whom none ever better understood nor were more universally acquainted with the rabbins and their writings.

Buxtorf, after he has mentioned all the fine things which can be said to recommend the use and study of the Talmud, adds these words: ‘ Thus you see, reader, with what impudence and impiety this obstinate and blind people extol and magnify their Talmud, and the authors of it: and can it seem strange that these neglect the law of God, to follow the traditions of their fathers<sup>h</sup>?’

But Dr. Lightfoot’s words are, if possible, fuller yet than any, and may serve for a compendium of all I have been hitherto saying. ‘ There are some,’ says the doctor, ‘ who believe the holy Bible was pointed by the wise men of Tiberias. I do not wonder at the impudence of the Jews who invented the story; but I wonder at the credulity of Christians who applaud it. Recollect, I beseech you, the names of the rabbins of Tiberias, from the first situation of the university there, to the time that it expired; and what, at

<sup>d</sup> Letter of Advice, &c. i. p. 33.

<sup>e</sup> Scaligerana, p. 218. Qui estoit honneste homme pour un Juif.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. p. 218, 219. Raro Judæus aliquis Christianus factus, fuit bonus, semper sunt nequam.

<sup>g</sup> Gener. 14. Licet plenus est inextricabilibus mendaciis, et contra omnem divinam legem, sacram Scripturæ sc. et naturæ legem conscriptus, sub pœna tamen capitis edictum est, nequis neget quicquam eorum quæ in eo dicuntur. [This quotation out of Naclerus must have been taken somewhere at second-hand. The author’s own words at this place (loosely) cited are: ‘ Circa hæc tempora [A.D. 400.] componitur Talmud Judæorum, id est Judaica doctrina,

‘ a duobus Rabinis, s. Rabina et Rabasse; ‘ liber major decem bibliis, in quo sunt ‘ inextricabilia mendacia contra omnem ‘ legem divinam, naturæ, ac Scripturam. ‘ Videntes enim legem suam in dies ‘ deficere, et fidem Christianam proficere ‘ in toto orbe, hos duos instigarunt rabbi- ‘ nos, prohibentes, sub pœna mortis, ne- ‘ quis aliquid negaret de his quæ in eo con- ‘ tinentur.’ See Jo. Nacleri Chronica, fol. *Coloniae*, 1579. vol. ii. Generat. 14. p. 553.]

<sup>h</sup> Abbreviat. &c. p. 241. Vides, lector, obstinatissimæ et obsecratissimæ gentis, de suo Talmud et ejus compilatoribus, impudentissima et impia elogia. An ergo mirum, quod Dei verbum reliquerunt, et patrum traditiones secuti sunt?

'length, do you find, but a kind of men mad with Pharisaism, bewitching with traditions, and bewitched, blind, guileful, doting, they must pardon me if I say, magical and monstrous? Men how unfit, how unable, how foolish, for the undertaking so divine a work! Read over the Jerusalem Talmud, and see there how R. Judah, R. Chaninah, &c., and the rest of the grand doctors among the rabbins of Tiberias behave themselves; how earnestly they do nothing; how childishly they handle serious matters; how much of sophistry, froth, poison, smoke, nothing at all, there is in their disputes! And if you can believe the Bible was pointed in such a school, believe also all that the Talmudists write<sup>i</sup>.'

4. But above all, this appears from the divine authority of the Son of God himself, and his disciples; who often give us the worst character of the rabbins and governors of the Jews that it is possible to conceive. St. John calls the Pharisees, &c., that came to his baptism, *a generation of vipers*, Matt. iii. 7, and our Lord himself says of them, chap. xii. 34, *O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things?* and detects several of their enormities in the woes he pronounces against them, Matt. xxiii. and chap. xxi. 31, which represents them to be worse than the most profligate part of mankind, and such whose testimony would signify nothing in any case.

The protomartyr Stephen, Acts vii. 51, speaking to them, says, *Ie stiffnecked—ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, &c.* But not to multiply instances of this nature, which every body is well acquainted with, I will add but one more, which reaches expressly the thing in dispute, and proves their traditions concerning washings made void the law. Mark vii. 8, &c. *Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well he reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition—Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered.* And our Lord concludes his censure with these words, *They be blind leaders of the blind*, Matt. xv. 14. All which, if there be any thing sacred and awful, and that deserves our most serious regard, in our Saviour's words, must at least signify, that they are a dangerous sort of men, and rather to be shunned than followed: for he has expressly commanded us to *beware of their leaven*.

Since then the Jews and their writings are so much to be distrusted, and are so scandalous and fallacious; can what they say be

<sup>i</sup> Vol. ii. p. 73.

called with any prudence, ‘the true basis of infant-baptism<sup>k</sup>?’ To conclude: what is built upon this basis is a rabbinical tradition, and one of those washings which our Lord condemns; but not a Christian baptism.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

## LETTER X.

ARRIAN, from whom Mr. Wall next argues, too late to determine the matter—He may perhaps only speak of the purifications for pollutions—The Pagans frequently confounded the Jews and Christians together, as appears from Themistius; from Arrian himself; from Lucian; from Tacitus; from Suetonius—And Rigaltius understands Arrian’s words so too—As do also Petavius, Lipsius, and Barthius—Mr. Wall’s argument from Gregory Nazianzen, examined—This Father lived too late to determine our dispute; and does not speak of an initiatory baptism—The Scripture makes no mention of any initiatory baptism in use among the Jews—Exod. xix. 10 makes nothing to the purpose—Maimonides, his rule of interpretation false—The rabbins very bad interpreters—*Sanctify* does not necessarily imply washing—Nothing in the words which so much as intimates the body was to be washed—There is no mention of an initiatory baptism in any authentic ancient history; even though they had the fairest occasions, and ought not to have omitted it, if there had been any such usage—This illustrated by some instances from Josephus and Ganz—It is on many accounts very improbable that the Jews had any such ceremony—Proved from St. Paul’s words; from Gregory Nazianzen; from St. Peter—Several authors of reputation, and especially the ancients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory baptism among the Jews—Thus St. Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem—Many writers say our baptism came instead (not of baptism among the Jews, but) of sacrifices; as the Recognitions—Or of the washings for pollutions, as the Apostolical Constitutions pretend—And Mr. Hill speaks to this purpose—Others more commonly say, it succeeds in the place of circumcision—The conclusion from these observations—Though the Jews could be proved to have baptized their proselytes, this does no service to that cause of paedobaptism.—For, 1. It does not appear that infants were so admitted.—2. If the Jews had such a baptism as is pretended, it is no rule to Christians; otherwise the Socinians, &c., have a good handle to lay aside the use of baptism—And there is no manner of analogy between the pretended Jewish and the Christian paedobaptism—3. We need only go back to the baptism of St. John; which there is more reason to think was the pattern of Christ’s than a Jewish ceremony—St. John, Christ, and his apostles, baptized no infants—A passage of Josephus to this purpose—Another from Origen—Another of St. Paul—4. At best this supposed baptism of the Jews is only a traditionary ceremony from the rabbins—Their quoting texts for it no proof of its divine institution—The rabbins do not pretend to find an initiatory baptism in the Scriptures; but confess it is only a

<sup>k</sup> Dr. Hammond’s Six Queries, page 195, margin.



tradition of their elders—This proved from the words of the Talmud—Which are explained by some rules of Maimonides—Exod. xix. 10. cited only by way of accommodation—It is therefore great presumption to draw a rabbinical tradition into a precedent for the Christian church—These things applied to the present dispute—The Conclusion.

SIR,

HAVING shewn that the citations from the Jewish writers prove nothing at all, and do our adversaries no service; I proceed now to Mr. Wall's other arguments, which are brought to prove, that the Jews before, and at our Saviour's time, were wont to initiate proselytes and their children by baptism.

He insists upon some words of Arrian, the philosopher of Nicomedia.

1. But first, this philosopher lived not till about one hundred and fifty years after Christ<sup>a</sup>, and therefore at best will not prove that custom to have been more ancient; for he only speaks of his own time, without any reference to the past.

2. Or secondly, he may, for what appears to the contrary, allude not to any initiatory washing, but to the frequent purifications for legal pollutions; and the *hemerobaptistæ*, or, as Justin Martyr<sup>b</sup> calls them, the *βαπτισταί*, have their denomination from this, and from their teaching, says the Renunciation cited by Cotelerius, 'That no man could be saved unless he was washed daily<sup>c</sup>;' and not because they were daily initiated. And Eusebius<sup>d</sup> tells us, from Hegesippus, that one sect of the Jews, who were very zealous for these washings, were called peculiarly by his name. It may seem more probable too that Arrian alludes to this sect and these washings, if we call to mind that rule of the Talmud mentioned by Dr. Lightfoot, if I remember well, 'That a woman baptized or washed, though for uncleanness only, does nevertheless thereby become a complete proselytess or Jewess<sup>e</sup>.' The Talmud itself therefore determines, that washing for uncleanness does constitute a complete Jew; which is the utmost that Arrian says, and therefore it is not necessary to understand him of any other washing. But,

3. It was common for the Pagan writers to confound the Jews and Christians together; for Christ himself and his apostles being

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Chron. p. 213.

<sup>b</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 307. [sect. 80. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>c</sup> Codic. Regio 18r8. ad Recognit. Clement. p. 499 b. Μη δύνασθαι ἀνθρώπων

σωθῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν βαπτίζεται.

<sup>d</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 22.

<sup>e</sup> Jebamoth, fol. 45 b.

Jews by birth, and sent primarily to preach to that people, and the first churches consisting of Jews for the most part, the heathen, who were not well enough acquainted with these things, might easily suppose the Christians were only a sect of the Jews, that made a separation from their ancient governors upon account of some particular opinions among themselves. Festus plainly takes it so when he tells king Agrippa, that Paul's accusers had only *certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive*, Acts xxv. 19. And elsewhere in the Scriptures the apostles are often spoken of as Jews; nay, sometimes the Christians are argued to be Jews, in the best and truest sense; *He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, &c., but he is a Jew which is one inwardly*, Rom. ii. 28. *And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed*, &c. Gal. iii. 29.

This is apparent also from many passages in the Greek and Latin authors. Themistius, citing some words from the Old Testament, calls it, 'the Law of the Assyrians<sup>f</sup>;' and in several other places he gives it the same name<sup>g</sup>. And somewhere, as Petavius notes<sup>h</sup>, he calls it Syrian, which will be construed nothing less than calling the Jews, Assyrians and Syrians, from the country they dwelt in; and yet, at another time, by Syrians, he means the Christians, namely, in his Oration to the Emperor Jovian, where he extols the emperor's generosity and justice in permitting every one to follow what religion he thought best. 'For,' says he, 'the Syrians perform divine worship in one manner, the Greeks in another, and the Egyptians in a way different from both: nay, and the Syrians themselves do not agree in all things; no one believes exactly as his neighbour, but this believes one thing, and that another<sup>i</sup>,' &c. Here he manifestly has his eye upon the quarrels and disputes which then disturbed the Church of Christ, and made too great a noise not to be observed by the enemies of our holy profession; especially by so great a man as Themistius, who artfully improves this opportunity to insinuate how very uncertain the Christians were in their belief, thereby to possess the emperor with an ill opinion of them, to whom he was known to be very much inclined.

Thus Themistius, then, by the same word Syrians, means both Jews and Christians, whom he does not sufficiently distinguish from one another: for the Christians as well as the Jews appeared first in

<sup>f</sup> Orat. v. p. 141. Δόγμω τῷ Ἀσσυρίῳ, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Orat. vii. Init. et Orat. ix. p. 201.

<sup>h</sup> Ad Orat. xii. p. 635.

<sup>i</sup> Page 282. Ἄλλως Σύρους ἐθέλει πολίτευεσθαι, ἄλλως Ἑλλήνας, ἄλλως Λίγυπious.

καὶ οὐδ' αὐτοὺς Σύρους ὁμοίως, ἀλλ' ἥδη κατακερμάτισται εἰς μικρά· εἰς γὰρ οὐδεὶς τῷ πέλας τὰ αὐτὰ ὑπέλκεν ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν, τοδί, ὁ δὲ, τοδί. [Orat. xii. prope f.]

Syria, and about those parts of Asia which were generally counted the chief nursery of that religion: and therefore Lucian says, 'From the several cities in Asia came some who were sent from the public body of the Christians<sup>k</sup>,' &c. And it is very probable this may be one occasion of their confounding Christians and Jews together: therefore Le Prieur says, 'Every body knows that the church was at first gathered at Jerusalem, and consisted of Jews; and from hence it is that in profane writers you hardly find any difference made between Jews and Christians<sup>l</sup>.'

Galilee, the Upper and the Lower, was mostly inhabited by Jews, at least one part of it entirely, together with a large portion of the other called Galilee of the Gentiles, Matt. iv. 15, of which Strabo is understood to say, 'That it was inhabited by a mixture of Egyptians, Arabians, and Phœnicians<sup>m</sup>.' Galileans therefore could at first mean only Jews of Galilee, or Galilean Jews; and accordingly St. Peter is by his speech discovered to be a Galilean, Mark xiv. 70, that is, a native Jew of Galilee: and so in that known blasphemy of Julian the Apostate, when dying he cried out, 'Galilean, thou hast conquered men<sup>n</sup>;' it is the same thing as if he had said, 'Thou Galilean Jew;' for he means Christ, who was a Jew, and dwelt in Nazareth in Galilee. For in these and such like places, the name seems to signify one sort of the Jews in particular, as if they were something different from others who were not of that country.

I know these words may sometimes be only used to express the country: as a Greek may mean one born or bred in Greece; a Roman, a freeman of Rome; and a Turk, one born in Turkey. But if they have any reference to the religion or profession, or some quality and disposition of a person; then they always mean that religion, &c. which was most famous in that place at the time: and thus a Chaldaean signifies an *astrologer*; a wild Arab, a *robber*; and a Greek, in Scripture, is *one that practised the idolatries of Greece*: and the word *Jew*, with us, an instance pretty near the case in hand, does not always signify one born in Judæa, or of Jewish parents, but one who professes to live according to the law of the Jews, which doubtless is the sense Mr. Wall gives it in the passage of Arrian: and so does Galilean often signify that particular sort of the Jews. Thus St. Paul, though born at Tarsus in Cilicia, and educated at Jerusalem, and consequently no Galilean by birth or habitation, is notwithstanding called a Galilean by Lucian<sup>o</sup>;

<sup>k</sup> De Morte Peregrin. p. 567.

<sup>l</sup> In Tertullian.

<sup>m</sup> Geograph. lib. xvi. p. 1103.

<sup>n</sup> Theodor. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 25. fol. 320. Νενίκηκας, Γαλιλαῖε.

<sup>o</sup> Philopat. p. 770.

signifying, that he was a Jew of the sect who had embraced the new doctrines of Christianity; Galileans comprehending originally none but the Jews, for they only of that country adhered to Jesus.

But then it is wrong, and a confounding of matters, to call the Christians in general by that name, which should be attributed to none but Jews: Arrian therefore, whom Mr. Wall argues from in this case, has committed this mistake, when he says, ‘that through ‘a mad sort of humour, and the prevalency of a custom among them, ‘the Galileans have learnt to despise the power and severity of ‘magistrates.’ By Galileans here, he cannot be understood to mean any but the Christians, whose courage and firmness of mind in persecution was very well known to their adversaries, and was falsely ascribed by them to perverseness and obstinacy. As you may see the emperor Marcus Antoninus censures them, when representing a mind duly prepared to live or die in whatever manner one may be called to it, he says, ‘This indifference, or willingness to ‘submit to one’s lot, should spring from a discreet and well-weighed ‘judgment of things; not as it is with the Christians, from stubbornness, but from serious consideration, and a serenity of mind, ‘which may persuade others to imitate your examples.’

What I cited from Arrian, who is Mr. Wall’s own author, shews, that he called the Christians by a name which belonged only to the Jews; for I believe Mr. Wall cannot find a place where Galilean signifies any but Jews, unless it be this of Arrian, and such others. It follows then that Arrian does confound the Jews and Christians together; and therefore he may be understood to speak of the Christians under the name *Jews*, in the passage Mr. Wall refers to; for he may as well call the Christians Jews as Galileans, since the Galileans, as I have often repeated it, and particularly those from whom the Christians are called so, were only Jews.

I think it is a very plain case, that Lucian took the Christians at least for a sect of the Jews; when speaking of the impostor he calls Peregrinus, he says, ‘At which time he learned the admired wisdom ‘of the Christians, by conversing with their priests and scribes.’ What priests and scribes were among the Christians? Lucian mistakes the matter, and thinks the Christian religion was taught by the Jewish priests, &c. When Tacitus in his account of the

P In Epictet. lib. iv. cap. 7. p. 400. *Εἶτα ὑπὸ μανίας μὲν δύνανται τις οὕτω διατεθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα, καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθους οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι.*

q Lib. ix. § 3. *Τὸ δὲ ἔτοιμον τοῦτο, ἵνα ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως ἐρχηται, μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἀλλὰ λελογι-*

*σμένως, καὶ σεμνῶς, καὶ ὥστε καὶ ἄλλον πείσαι, ἀπραγῶδως*

r De Morte Peregrin. p. 565. *“Οτεπερ καὶ τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐξέμαθε, περὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ γραμματεῦσιν αὐτῶν συγγενόμενος.*



Jews says, that 'those who came over to them are circumcised<sup>s</sup>;' and that among the very first principles, they are taught 'to despise 'and slight their parents and children, and brethren;' it is very probable he alludes to that passage of our Saviour, *If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters—he cannot be my disciple*, Luke xiv. 26.

But the common instance cited from Suetonius is, if possible, more plain. 'Claudius,' says he, 'expelled the Jews out of Rome, 'upon account of the continual disturbances they made there by 'the instigation of Christ'. But Christ was the leader and head of the Christians only, and not of the Jews. Suetonius therefore, when he said Jews, meant, or at least included the Christians. And so likewise in the passage Mr. Wall, and before him Dr. Hammond, cites from Arrian, that philosopher may refer only to the Christians, notwithstanding he calls them Jews. Rigaltius, without any manner of hesitation, understands him so: 'Even the Stoics,' says he, 'knew that the faithful,' that is, the Christians, 'were made 'such completely by their baptism. For thus Arrian expressly 'says<sup>u</sup>,' &c., and here he transcribes the very words. The learned Petavius is also of this opinion<sup>x</sup>. Lipsius takes the place in the same sense, and compares it with the words of Suetonius above cited; and says, 'For who were baptized but the Christians?' And Barthius says upon it, 'Baptism was not the distinguishing sign of 'a Jew, but of a Christian<sup>z</sup>.'

And it is certain, that supposing the Jews did baptize, yet circumcision was the great badge of a Jew; and so necessary, that they are often called from it in Scripture *the circumcision*, emphatically. Arrian therefore could not be well understood to say, the proselytes became complete Jews by being baptized, since circumcision was the more known and essential ceremony with them. Petavius<sup>a</sup> indeed imagines the passage in Arrian is corrupted, and that instead of ἡρημένον, we should read περιηρημένον; and so makes the place speak of baptism and circumcision too. But the criticism is too bold and licentious, without the authority of any copy, and

<sup>s</sup> Historiar. lib. v. prope ab init. Transgressi in morem eorum, idem usurpant: nec quidquam prius imbuuntur quam,—parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere.

<sup>t</sup> In Claud. cap. 25. Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.

<sup>u</sup> In Tertul. de Baptismo, p. 229. lit. g. Fideles perfici baptismo, sciebant etiam Stoici. Sic enim disertissime Arrianus

Epict. ii. 9, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Not. in Themist. Orat. xii. p. 635.

<sup>y</sup> Ad Annal. Tacit. lib. xv.

<sup>z</sup> Ad Rutillii Itinerarium. Sane Judæi signaculum non erat baptizatum esse, sed Christiani.

<sup>a</sup> Not. ad Themist. Orat. xii. p. 635.

[See the notes of various editors on the passage, collected by Schweighæuser, in vol. ii. of his edition of Epictetus.]

grounded only on Petavius' fancy ; and therefore I see no reason to admit it. But if by Jews he meant converts to Christianity, who at first were chiefly Jews, the expression is well enough, for they were always received into the body of Christians by baptism : and not before, but after this ceremony, they were accounted complete Christians ; which is all very suitable to Arrian's words : ' that after baptism, and the public profession, they were accounted, and really ' were true Jews,' or rather Christians<sup>b</sup>. And if this be the sense of the passage, then Arrian does not prove what our adversaries cite him for.

The next argument Mr. Wall recurs to, in order to establish the true 'basis of infant-baptism,' is a passage in Gregory Nazianzen : where that Father undertakes to reckon up all the various sorts of baptism he knew of, and considers the reasons of them. ' Moses baptized, but that was in water only. And before that in the cloud, and in the sea. But this was all typical, as also St. Paul understands it. The sea typified *the water* ; the cloud *the Spirit* ; the manna in the wilderness signified *the bread of life* ; and the water they there drank, *the divine cup*. John also baptized, yet ' not in water barely as the Jews did, but likewise to repentance<sup>c</sup>,' &c. In the following words he adds the baptism of Christ, the baptism of the Spirit, and the baptism of blood. But this part I need not transcribe, because Mr. Wall grounds his argument on the first words only ; which, he thinks, prove that the Jews did undoubtedly initiate their proselytes by baptism, since they themselves were also at first so initiated.

But here I must first make the common remark which affects all Mr. Wall's arguments, namely, that the authority he uses is of much too late a date : for St. Gregory lived but about the latter end of the fourth century, which is not early enough to give an infallible certainty of what was done in Christ's time, and much less in that of Moses. Besides, St. Gregory does not speak of an initiatory baptism, but only of the legal washings for uncleanness. And this is so obvious, that one would wonder how any man could pretend to understand him otherwise. For since he goes to enumerate all the kinds of baptism ; and the *divers washings* mentioned in the scripture were so very notorious, and could not possibly be forgot ; it is unaccountable how any one can persuade himself, that

<sup>b</sup> Epictet. Dissert. lib. ii. cap. 9. "Οταν δ' ἀναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τὸ τοῦ βεβαμμένον καὶ ἡγούμενον, τότε καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος.

<sup>c</sup> Orat. xxxix. p. 634. Ἐβρίπτισε Μωϋ-

σῆς, ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι· καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσῃ. τοπικῶς δὲ τοῦτο ἦν, ὡς καὶ Παῦλος δοκεῖ· ἡ θάλασσα τοῦ ὕδατος, &c.

St. Gregory would entirely pass over these common washings, which were so well known, and speak of some other strange baptism not mentioned in Scripture, nor by any author of credit.

It cannot be fairly denied that the words may very naturally be understood of those legal washings, and that there is no one circumstance in them which in the least insinuates they mean any thing else; and therefore it is a pitiful begging of the question, to say, they refer to any such baptism as our adversaries maintain: on the contrary, I take this, and all such passages, to make against them; for though St. Gregory sets himself to reckon up all the baptisms he knew of, and mentions several, yet he never takes the least notice of a baptism to initiate Jews or proselytes: which must import thus much, viz. that St. Gregory knew no such initiatory baptism.

And now, sir, I think I may say, these are all the arguments Mr. Wall employs to establish his position, that the Jews at our Saviour's time initiated their proselytes by baptism. He cites indeed Cyprian and Basil, and might perhaps have added several others to as much purpose; but what they say amounts to no more than what was said by St. Gregory, and may receive the same answer. And from hence it is sufficiently evident Mr. Wall has said nothing which rises to any probable proof that this 'main basis of infant baptism' is true. For I leave you to judge whether every pretence to this has not been sufficiently refuted.

To prove negatives is always difficult, and sometimes impossible; and therefore I might be excused from any farther trouble on this head. However, since it may be of use to confirm my notion of this matter, I will endeavour to make out, as far as it shall seem needful, these following observations:

1. I observe the Scripture makes no mention of any such baptism; and yet one cannot tell how to think it should be silent, if either God had appointed the practice, or if it had been used on any other foundation before those sacred books were written: for frequent occasions would have offered to take notice of this, as well as of several other institutions of God, or traditions of their elders; and without doubt it would have been touched on, had there been any such thing in use. Mr. Wall, I know, puts us in mind, that the rabbins cite *Exod. xix. 10*, to prove that the Jews themselves were initiated, upon the giving of the law, by baptism.

But in answer to this it may be noted, that they did not by this washing enter into covenant with God, for that they had done before by circumcision, which was the seal of the covenant; and

therefore the washing here mentioned was no more an initiatory baptism than the washings of the priests and Levites, preparatory to their several ministrations, and those appointed for pollutions, which all persons were strictly to perform before they entered the congregation of the Lord to worship. The sanctification and washing therefore, mentioned in the words referred to, seem to mean only such kind of purification as was common in all cases of approaching to God, and was to be repeated as often as such approaches were made. Though indeed something extraordinary might be enjoined on this uncommon and wonderful appearance of God, in such amazing majesty and glory.

That the purification was of this nature only, may seem more probable, if we observe, that one part of it was to consist in their *not coming at their wives*, verse 15, and the eastern nations always thought this polluted, and rendered them unfit to enter the temple, as Herodotus<sup>d</sup>, Strabo<sup>e</sup>, &c., assure us. And Ahimelech, when David required the shew-bread of him, makes this condition, that *the young men have kept themselves at least from women*, 1 Sam. xxi. 4. And more generally it appears from Gen. xxxv. 2, that this was but a purification necessary in order to perform any religious worship; for Jacob, being about to build an altar to the Lord, orders all his household to *be clean, and change their garments*: which is exactly the same thing with that expressed, Exod. xix. 10. Of the same nature likewise is that obligation laid on the Israelites by Moses and Eleazar, after their destroying the Midianites, that *whosoever hath killed any person, and whosoever hath touched any slain, should purify themselves, &c., and ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean*, Numb. xxxi. 19, 24. And so Joshua, ch. iii. 5, commands the Israelites to sanctify themselves, that is, according to Mr. Wall's notion of the word, to wash themselves, *for to-morrow the Lord will do wonders among you*; which implies these sanctifications were usual in such extraordinary cases. And thus among the heathens, those who came to consult the oracle of Trophonius were to wash themselves in the river Hereyna<sup>f</sup>. And the priests at Delphos washed themselves before they went to the temple<sup>g</sup>.

So that we see this is only a common purification, always used to qualify persons to appear before God; and therefore Mr. Wall, or the rabbins he cites, have no reason to pretend the sanctification and washing mentioned Exod. xix. 10, signifies any thing else.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. ii. p. 71.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. xvi. p. 1081.

<sup>f</sup> Pausan. lib. xix. p. 603.

<sup>g</sup> Eurip. in Iove, vers. 96.



But besides all this, I do not perceive the necessity of supposing the words respect the washing of the body, which is neither expressed nor implied. As to the authority of the rabbins, who, our author informs us from Selden, do generally favour his fancy, I have already shewn they are not to be depended on. The rule Maimonides has accommodated our author with, 'That wheresoever in the law the washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means still the washing of the whole body,' I think serves but to manifest the confidence of the rabbins, and our author's credulity. For, without inquiring into the reason of the rule, Mr. Wall takes it solely upon trust, as a maxim of interpretation. But why should the rules, which the rabbins arbitrarily lay down, be urged in opposition to the plain letter and propriety of the original text?

The most that can be said for these interpreters in the present case is, that they must be supposed to understand the idiom and phrases of the Hebrew tongue, and therefore may be qualified, by their observations and knowledge of that kind, to direct us in finding out the sense of the Old Testament. But the vanity of this argument in their favour appears by what I have said above. And our great English rabbin, Dr. Lightfoot, was so far from entertaining such an opinion of them, that he judged them unfit to point the Bible<sup>b</sup>, much more to make standing rules for the interpretation of it. Without having any regard therefore to these guides, it may easily be proved, that there is nothing which does import the washing of the body. For,

1. קדשתם is only a general word, enjoining something to be done through the whole term of the time mentioned; and therefore Munster and Vatablus, two great judges, besides others, say, it signifies here *to prepare*, as the Targums of Onkelos and Ben Uziel likewise appear to have understood it, by rendering it תומננו. And why should it mean *to wash* here, any more than in Levit. xxi. 23, or xx. 7, where God commands, *Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy*, &c.? Nay, if it should be allowed to signify the Israelites were to sanctify themselves on this great occasion by all the ways in general which they at any time used, and consequently by bathing for pollutions, yet what has this to do with a standing initiatory baptism? And why must a command, on so singular and extraordinary an occasion, be drawn into a precedent, and made a rule for ordinary cases? But,

2. Neither does this washing seem to be intended; because, though there is particular mention of washing their clothes, there

<sup>b</sup> [See above, page 225.]

is none of washing their bodies too; and yet no man can imagine why either should be particularly mentioned, if both had been included in the word *to sanctify*; nor if neither were comprehended in the word, that the washing of the body was meant, though the washing of the garments only is expressed. For, whence should they gather this? The word in the Hebrew for *wash*, is only proper to washing of clothes, to which it is applied, and cannot be used to signify the washing of the body. The washing of the body cannot be included under washing of the clothes, because these are not only two very different things, but are also as distinctly and particularly expressed, when both are intended. Thus, Levit. xv. 5, *Whosoever toucheth his bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, &c.* And again, ver. 13, *He shall number to himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, &c.* And Levit. xiv. 8, it is said very distinctly, as of things independent of one another, *He that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and wash himself, &c.*, and so very frequently elsewhere.

If the rule of Maimonides, that the washing of the garments means the washing of the body too, were good, then the washing of the body would not be so particularly expressed; whereas you see, sir, that always when the washing of the body is intended, it is as plainly expressed, and that by a different word too, viz. רחץ; and that even in conjunction with that other washing of the clothes which is constantly signified by כבס. This is all I think needful to confirm my first observation, viz. That the Scripture makes no mention of any baptism whereby the Jews and their proselytes were initiated.

2. In the next place I observe, that there is no instance or mention of this baptism, in any other authentic ancient history. I must take this for granted, till such an one is produced; and that it has not yet been done, is a great presumption that none can be found. Nay, it may be proved as well as a negative can be, that there was no such practice; because in the accounts of the proselytism of some, when the historians had the fairest occasion in the world to take notice of it, they have mentioned circumcision without so much as glancing at this pretended baptism. Thus Josephus informs us, that Hyrcanus, after having subdued the Idumeans, made and initiated them Jews by circumcision only; for had any thing else been as necessary, Hyrcanus would have performed it, and the judicious historian would not have forgot to mention it; but since he has not left the least intimation of it, I reckon we

have the double authority, viz. of Hyrcanus who was high priest, and of Josephus, on our side. The historian's own words run thus: 'Hyrcanus also took Adora and Marissa; and having subdued all Idumæa, he gave the inhabitants leave to continue in that country, on condition they would be circumcised, and observe the laws and customs of the Jews. They, therefore, unwilling to be expelled their native country, received circumcision, and led their lives according to the manner of the Jews<sup>i</sup>.' And in another place he tells us, that Aristobulus, son of the above-named Hyrcanus, caused the Ituræans to be made proselytes by circumcision, and says nothing of baptism. 'He obliged them that would stay in the land to be circumcised, and live according to the laws and customs of the Jews<sup>k</sup>.' And Philo, another considerable author, is in like manner wholly silent of this baptism. To be sure, if there had been any thing in these or such like authors, we should have heard of it over and over; but their silence, even when they are professedly giving an account of the customs and antiquities of the Jews, is a very weighty consideration, and ought to go a great way toward demonstrating, that no such thing either was, or ought to be practised.

An instance of this nature I remember likewise in Ganz, one of the best historians among the rabbins: at the year 3670, he says, 'Many great and powerful cities became the allies of Alexander, the brother of Aristobulus, and were circumcised:' and never mentions any other part of the initiation.

3. But thirdly, I observe, that what our adversaries pretend, is very improbable, upon several other accounts. For instance, when St. Paul says, the *Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea*; he seems very plainly to intimate there was no other baptizing unto Moses but this: why else should he call this the baptizing unto Moses? It would have been much more natural to refer to that more familiar initiatory baptism which our adversaries plead for, if the apostles had known of it, than to this figurative one. And then to make this parallel to our baptism, is very improper, if they had used another which resembled ours. The fathers of the Jews, then, were baptized unto Moses; but how? If you will

<sup>i</sup> Antiquit. Judaic. lib. xiii. c. 17. p. 450 E. Ἑρκανὸς δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας αἰρεῖ πόλεις Ἀδωρα. καὶ Μάρισσαν. καὶ ἅπαντας τοὺς Ἰδουμαίους ὑποχειρίους ποιησάμενος, ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς μένειν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ, εἰ περιτέμνουν τε τὰ αἰδοῦα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις νόμοις χρῆσθαι θελοῖεν. οἱ δὲ πόθω τῆς πατρίου γῆς καὶ τὴν περιτομὴν καὶ τὴν

ἄλλην τοῦ βίου διαίταν ὑπέμειναν τὴν αὐτὴν Ἰουδαίους ποιήσασθαι. [Cap. ix. sect. 1. edit. Hudson.]

<sup>k</sup> Antiquitat. Judaic. lib. xiii. cap. 19. p. 455 C. Ἀναγκάσας τε τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας εἰ βούλονται μένειν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ περιτέμνεσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίων νόμους ζῆν. [Cap. xi. sect. 3. edit. Hudson.]

believe the apostle, by being *baptized in the cloud, and in the sea*. This was their baptism unto Moses, St. Paul says; and can our adversaries venture to say, This was not their baptism, but another?

Gregory Nazianzen, in the very passage cited by Mr. Wall, which I transcribed above something more largely than he had done, without taking notice of any other baptism from whence ours was derived, or to which it might be compared, only shews how this, mentioned by the apostle as the type, might be explained in these words, *the sea typified the water, the cloud the Spirit*. Now, his noting no such likeness in any other Jewish baptism, makes the passage an argument rather against Mr. Wall; and implies, that he thought this baptism alone corresponded with ours.

In another place, the apostle Peter makes our baptism to be the antitype of *the ark in which few were saved by water*; for so we likewise are saved by the water of baptism. But is it not strange the sacred writers should point out these allusions, and yet never in the least hint at the ancient ceremony from whence our baptism, it is pretended, was immediately borrowed? Nothing surely can look more improbable.

4. Several authors of reputation, especially the ancients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory baptism among the Jews, which was the original of ours. This observation is grounded on abundance of passages.

The apostle Barnabas, in that catholic epistle, (if indeed it be his,) whereof we have the greatest part still remaining in the original, though he is wholly employed about the Jewish rites, &c., has not one word concerning the baptism our paedobaptists contend for; which, being the same as to externals with one of our holy sacraments, could not, had this holy man known it, have been passed by at such a time. Nay more, in one place he applies himself to find out some preludes of our Christian baptism; and yet even there, where it would have been so natural and necessary, we meet with no footsteps of it. ‘Let us see,’ says he, ‘whether God took care to manifest any thing beforehand concerning water and the cross<sup>k</sup>.’ Who would not expect here to have that baptism itself mentioned which was the forerunner and type of ours, and from whence it was immediately taken, if there had been any such? As a type of the cross, he mentions the brasen serpent in the wilderness; and does not forget the posture in which Moses stood when the Israelites and Amalekites were engaged, Exod. xvii. 8, &c.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. 11. Ζητήσωμεν δὲ εἰ ἡμέλλησε τῷ Κυρίῳ προφανερῶσαι περὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ.



When he let down his hands the Amalekites prevailed, and when he held up his hands Israel prevailed, verse 11; which was to signify, says St. Barnabas, ‘that except they trust in him, they cannot be saved<sup>l</sup>.’ I think it cannot be doubted, but St. Barnabas would have taken the same method in regard to baptism, and have mentioned the original of it among the Jews, if he had been acquainted with it; whereas he only cites some passages of the prophets, which he applies to baptism, after he had said, ‘As for baptism, it is written ‘to the people of Israel, that they shall not receive that baptism ‘which brings to forgiveness of sins, but shall institute to themselves others<sup>m</sup>.’ He means, as Menard is of opinion, their frequent superstitious washings. And these being the only vicarious baptisms he speaks of, it is probable he knew no other, in whose stead ours was at first instituted, and is at present continued.

Justin Martyr, in his long dispute with Trypho the Jew, mentions perhaps all their other rites, and their legal washings, but is utterly silent as to this initiatory baptism; and there are some passages which seem to argue he was ignorant of it. In one place he says thus, ‘As therefore circumcision began in Abraham, and the ‘sabbath and sacrifices, and oblations and holy days, were first ‘instituted by Moses, all which we have proved were appointed ‘because of the hardness of the people’s hearts: so they ought all ‘now to cease, according to the will of the Father, in him that was ‘born of the virgin, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, ‘and of the stock of David, even Jesus Christ the Son of God.— ‘And we who through him find access to God do not receive the ‘circumcision of the flesh, but that spiritual one which Enoch and ‘such like observed: and this we receive by baptism through the ‘mercy of God, and all are permitted to receive it this way<sup>n</sup>.’ It is observable here that the martyr asserts, all the ceremonials of Moses were to end in Christ; baptism itself therefore, if it had been in use before, must have ceased likewise under the Gospel: but as this is contrary to the institution of our Lord, and the universal

<sup>l</sup> Cap. 12. “Οτι οὐ δύνανται σωθῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἐλπίσωσι.

<sup>m</sup> Cap. 11. Περὶ μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος, γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, πῶς τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ φέρον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν οὐ μὴ προσδέχονται· ἀλλ’ ἐαυτοῖς οἰκοδομήσουσι.

<sup>n</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. pag. 261 B. Ὡς οὖν ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ ἤρξατο περιτομῇ, καὶ ἀπὸ Μωσέως σάββατον καὶ θυσίαι καὶ προσφοραὶ καὶ ἑορταί, καὶ ἀπεδείχθη διὰ τὸ σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν ταῦτα διατετάχθαι, οὕτως παύσασθαι ἔδει κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς

βουλὴν, εἰς τὸν διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραάμ καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Δαβὶδ παρθένου γεννηθέντα Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν.— Καὶ ἡμεῖς, οἱ διὰ τούτου προσχωρήσαντες τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παρελάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνῶχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ, διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτὴν, ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγενόμεμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλάβομεν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφετὸν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν. [Sect. 43. edit. Benedict.]

knowledge and practice of the Christian Church, it is certain the holy martyr had no notion of any such baptism.

This seems a little more evident from the last part of the words, wherein he opposes our new circumcision, and our new way of receiving it, to their circumcision of the flesh: and as before he asserted, that began from Abraham, and was to end in Christ; his opposition here cannot mean less than that our baptism was a new thing which began in Christ, that is, with his new dispensation.

In another place, when the Jew acknowledged it was not necessary to observe the whole law at all times, because it was impossible, for instance, to kill the passover when the city and temple were destroyed; St. Justin puts him upon assigning what was necessary in his opinion: to which the Jew answers, ‘To keep ‘holy the sabbaths, to be circumcised, to observe the new moons, ‘and to be baptized or washed,’ (if he had stopped here, this would have been thought a great argument for Mr. Wall; but he adds,) ‘when one has touched and been defiled by any of those things ‘Moses has mentioned.’ The baptism the Jew speaks of here is confined by the last words to *purifications for pollution*; and since he mentions no other, it must be natural to suppose he allowed of no other: for St. Justin putting him to instance in things which might and ought to be observed, he would certainly have named *baptism for proselytism*, if there had been any, as well as circumcision, because it was as easy to be observed.

I remember one passage particularly in Tertullian, which is very cogent and plain to shew this initiatory baptism is a mere fable. Even in his time some wicked people, as he calls them, were arrived to that degree of boldness as to deny the necessity and usefulness of baptism, because they found faith alone had been sufficient to save some; and they seem to have objected that Abraham, &c., were saved by faith without baptism: to these he answers, ‘Though salvation was to be had by a bare faith before ‘our Lord’s coming, yet when the objects of our faith were multiplied, and we are to believe in his birth and passion and resurrection, then there is an addition made to the sacrament, to wit ‘the seal of baptism, which is the clothing as it were of faith, which ‘before was bare or naked.’ Nothing can be plainer than that

° Page 264 C. Κακείνος, τὸ σαββατίζειν λέγω, καὶ τὸ περιτέμνεσθαι, καὶ τὸ τὰ ἔμμηνα φυλάσσειν, καὶ τὸ βαπτίζεσθαι ἁγιάμενον τίνος ὡν ἀπηγόρευται ὑπὸ Μωσέως. Sect. 46.]

ρ De Baptismo, p. 229 D. Fuerit salus retro per fidem nudam ante Domini pas-

sionem et resurrectionem: at ubi fides aucta est credendi in nativitatem, passionem, resurrectionemque ejus, addita est ampliatio sacramento, obsignatio baptismi, vestimentum quodammodo fidei, quæ retro erat nuda. [cap. 13.]

Tertullian here makes baptism to be a new ordinance, not used till the Christian dispensation; for baptism, he says, was *then* instituted, when we were to believe in Christ: and till then *faith was naked* and not covered with this clothing; that is, they were to believe, but were not baptized. Several other passages might be added from this Father, as where he opposes the Christian baptism to the Jewish washings for pollution, not for initiation<sup>q</sup>. But this one is so clear that it may serve for all.

Origen also is very plain; for speaking of the notion of the Pharisees, that none could baptize beside Christ, or Elias, or that prophet, he says, in opposition to Heracleon, who had allowed it, that 'he cannot prove any prophet did ever baptize<sup>r</sup>,' neither Moses, nor any after him till John, whom the Pharisees reproved: from whence it seems evident that Origen did not know of any initiatory baptism among the Jews.

To these I add an illustrious instance from the writings of St. Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>s</sup>; who answering this question, why the grace was communicated by water rather than by any thing else? observes, 'that the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters, Gen. i. 2: that the coming out of Egypt was through the sea, Exod. xiv. 21: that Aaron was first washed, and afterwards installed 'high priest, Exod. xxix. 4; that the brasen laver, which was to be 'placed between the tabernacle and the altar, Exod. xxx. 18, was a 'symbol of baptism:' but he never gives the least intimation of any initiatory baptism which gave rise to it, though he had so fair an occasion to mention it, if such a rite had been in use. Were the same question proposed to Mr. Wall, instead of mentioning all those other things, we may be sure he would answer directly, that it having been a ceremony with the Jews from the time of Moses to initiate all persons by baptism, Christ was willing to continue the same mode of initiation in his church: and if our author's supposition were true, this would have been the proper answer to the question: nor is it to be imagined that St. Cyril would have omitted it, had he known or believed such a baptism. On the contrary, the following words seem to give us very strong presumptions to think he dated the beginning of that ceremony from St. John only.

Besides, it is said to come instead (not of a Jewish initiation, but)

<sup>q</sup> De Baptismo, p. 230 B. Ceterum Israel Judeus quotidie lavat, quia quotidie inquinatur. Quod ne in nobis quoque factitaretur, propterea de uno lavaero definitum est, &c. [cap. 15.]

<sup>r</sup> Comment. in Joan. p. 117 B. Οὐ

γὰρ ἔχει δεῖξαι τινα τῶν προφητῶν βαπτίσαντα. [Comm. tom. vi. sect. 13. apud Origen. Op. tom. iv. p. 125. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>s</sup> Catechetic. iii. p. 17.



of several other things ; which is not at all consistent with its being borrowed from the Jewish initiation, for then it could only be said to succeed that. The author of the Recognitions says, it was at first instituted at the cessation of sacrifices, in their stead ; his words are, ‘ Lest they should think when sacrifices were ceased, there could be no more remission of sins, he instituted a baptism by water ; in which, by calling on his name, they should be absolved from all their sins<sup>t</sup>.’

There is likewise a very remarkable passage in the Constitutions, where the Christian baptism is said to be instead of a Jewish : and if the following explication had not been added, this place, no doubt, would have been frequently turned upon us ; but these words have secured it on our side : ‘ Baptism, sacrifice, the priesthood, and their local worship, he has changed ; and instead of the daily washings under the law, he has given us one only baptism into his death<sup>u</sup>,’ &c.

Mr. Hill, a presbyter of the diocese of Bath and Wells, if he be of any authority with you, asserts the same thing : ‘ For to the Levitical washings answers our baptism ; to their sacrifices, the sacrifice of Christ<sup>x</sup>,’ &c. And those who say it succeeds in the Christian church in the place of circumcision in the Jewish, by this virtually confess the Jews had no such baptism ; for if there was such a rite among them, and our Lord took this ordinance from it, they ought to say our baptism succeeds to that, and not to circumcision. These same persons, it is true, at other times, derive it from the Jewish baptism too ; which plainly discovers their great prejudices and partiality, and how inconsistent they are with themselves.

But as to the Fathers, they seem in general never to have given into such an opinion, nor afforded our author the least intimation to build upon. I know they mention baptism unto Moses, and Jewish baptism ; but in these places, as you have in some degree seen, they always mean the baptism of the cloud and the sea, or some such typical one, or else the Jewish washings for purification : this must be very plain to any honest reader of their writings, and therefore I think it the less needful to insist more upon it.

Now to draw up the force and conclusion of these observations in

<sup>t</sup> Lib. i. cap. 39. Et ne forte putarent, cessantibus hostiis, remissionem sibi non fieri peccatorum, baptismum eis per aquam statuit ; in quo ab omnibus peccatis, invocato ejus nomine, solverentur.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. vi. cap. 23. Τὸ βάπτισμα, τὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἱερωσύνην, τὴν τοπικὴν λατρείαν, ἐτέρως μετεποίησεν· ἀντὶ μὲν καθήμε-

ρ.νοῦ, ἐν μόνον δοῦς βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Dissert. de Presbyteratu, lib. iv. cap. 3. § 3. Siquidem lotionibus Leviticis nostrum lavacrum, istorum sacrificiis Christi victima——ex adverso respondent.



short. If, as I have made out to you, there is no command in Scripture, nor instance in that nor any other authentic writing, of the Christian baptism's being derived from the Jews, but several considerable authors do, in effect, deny it, and place it in the stead, not of a Jewish initiatory baptism, but of something else: and if none of the more ancient writers in their discourses on the Jewish ceremonies do ever once mention this baptism of proselytes; nor, when treating expressly on the Christian sacrament, ever intimate they thought it was derived from any such original: then all this, I think, must prove, as fully as a negative can be proved, that there was no such practice among the Jews so anciently as is pretended.

And if, after all, any should continue to believe or assert the Jews did, from Moses to our Saviour's time, and so down, receive their proselytes by baptism, notwithstanding what I have urged to the contrary; yet on several other accounts, there is a great deal of reason to say, this custom of the Jews, though ever so true, can do no service to the cause of pædobaptism. For,

1. It does not in the least appear that infants were so admitted; and Mr. Wall does not offer the least colour of an argument to make it probable; but only cites a passage or two from the rabbins, whose authority I have proved to be of no great weight. But,

2. Even supposing proselytes and their infants were usually initiated by baptism; will it therefore follow the Christian baptism must be exactly the same, and administered to the same persons? By no means. How dangerous and pernicious this consequence is, appears from the handle it gives the Socinians, Quakers, and Libertines, to explode the use of this sacrament altogether among the offspring of Christian parents. For if the Jewish method in their supposed baptism must be the rule of ours, then none are to be baptized but those who turn from a different religion to the Christian: the first converts, and their children born before their baptism, are to be baptized, but none of their posterity born after their baptism; for this, our author says, was the practice of the synagogue, and 'our Saviour gave no direction for any alterations.'<sup>y</sup>

Mr. Wall takes notice of this difficulty<sup>z</sup>; but I think he says nothing to evade the force of it, and only notes, that both sides allow the necessity of this sacrament, and therefore we need not concern ourselves with this part of the pretended Jewish custom. But by Mr. Wall's leave, it does affect the dispute between us; for it is a common rule of disputation, 'That which proves too much, proves nothing at all.' And if a necessary consequence of more than is

<sup>y</sup> Introd. page 17. [16.]

<sup>z</sup> Ibid.

true follows from any premises, it is a certain sign those premises are not true; and if not true, they are to be rejected. This now is the case of the particular before us. For if the Jewish baptism was never administered to any but the first converts, and must be the rule to us of our practice; then we must not baptize those who are born of Christian parents, neither infants nor adult.

So that the premises upon which our adversaries build, and which they call 'the main basis of infant-baptism,' tend to throw this sacrament out of the church; which is undoubtedly a very wild and erroneous extreme. For in short, let the Socinians and others say what they please, the Scriptures assure us, baptism was instituted by Christ, and was, and ought to be, administered, *for the forgiveness of sins*; and therefore men ought to be very careful how they neglect that ordinance. And since the pædobaptists acknowledge this, they ought in prudence, and for the honour of God and of his sacraments, to lay aside those principles which are so destructive of the Christian economy.

Besides, according to the principles of the pædobaptists themselves, there is no manner of analogy between this pretended Jewish and the Christian pædobaptism; for the Jews, they suppose, baptized the parents together with the infants born to them, before their actual proselytism; but on the contrary, those born to Christian parents before their conversion to Christianity are accounted an unholy seed, and not capable of baptism; as Dr. Whitby<sup>a</sup>, and most pædobaptists, are of opinion. And again on the other hand, the Jews never baptized the children born of proselytes after their proselytism<sup>b</sup>; but on the contrary, the children of Christian parents, they pretend, should all be baptized, though born after their parents' conversion. In both cases running directly opposite to the pattern, which they tell us Christ 'took as he found it, giving no direction for any 'alteration<sup>c</sup>.'

Again, though the Jews should be allowed to have baptized the infant children of proselytes, it no more follows we must do so too, than that we ought to admit them to the other sacrament, because the Jews caused their infant children to eat of the paschal lamb; which is supposed to be a type of Christ, and of the supper he instituted, or borrowed from thence; nay, it would follow more strongly, that since infants were admitted to the shadow or type, they should now also be admitted to the antitype, which however our antagonists will not pretend.

3. In the third place, whatever might be the practice of the Jews,

<sup>a</sup> Annot. in 1 Cor. vii. 14.    <sup>b</sup> Wall's Introd. p. 12. [11.]    <sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 17. med. [16.]

we need only go back to St. John's baptism, which there is more reason to think was the pattern of Christ's than a Jewish ceremony, because he was our Saviour's immediate forerunner. And this our author confesses, when he says, 'The baptism indeed of the nations ' by the apostles ought to be regulated by the practice of John and of ' Christ himself—rather than by any preceding custom of the ' Jewish nation ; if we had any good ground to believe that they did ' in the case of infants differ, or alter any thing from the usual way<sup>d</sup>.'

If the practice then of St. John and Christ himself is sufficient, and the best rule we can go by, as far as it is plain, let us for the future allow no inventions of the Jews to be made an argument in the controversy ; for the practice of St. John and our Lord is abundantly plain from much better than rabbinical authority. The sense of the commission Christ gave his disciples, Matth. xxviii. 19, I have already proved does effectually exclude infants ; and what St. John acted is manifest, if we dare trust St. Matthew's account of the matter ; who tells us indeed, that John baptized *Jerusalem and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan*, but at the same time assures us, that as many as he baptized *confessed their sins*, Matth. iii. 5, 6. And therefore, as we cannot say some confessed their sins, in that evangelical sense, and yet were not baptized ; so neither may any pretend some were baptized, who yet did not and could not confess their sins. For your further satisfaction, you may look back to what is said about this in a former letter.

Eusebius transcribes a passage from Josephus very clear to this purpose, wherein the historian says thus of St. John, and his practice in relation to baptism ; ' He was a good man, and persuaded the Jews ' to righteousness, commanding them to deal justly with one another, ' and piously towards God, and so come to baptism. For baptism ' would be acceptable to him, when used, not for purging away some ' particular offences, but for purifying the body in general, the soul ' being before purified by righteousness<sup>e</sup>.' Josephus in these words, and Eusebius by transcribing them, do both assure us this was St. John's method. And, by the way, give me leave to observe, that St. John's initiatory baptism is here remarkably opposed to the Jewish washings *for particular offences*, viz. their legal uncleannesses ; which is as much as to say, the baptism of St. John was a new thing, and not like the other baptisms in use among them, that were ad-

<sup>d</sup> Introd. p. 18. [17.]

<sup>e</sup> Hist. Euseb. lib. i. cap. 11. Ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκῆσαι, καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνην καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐσεβεῖα χρωμένους, βαπ-

τισμῷ συνιέναι. οὕτω γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανείσθαι· μὴ ἐπὶ τινῶν ἁμαρτῶδων παραιτήσῃ χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνην, προεκκεκαθαρμένης.



ministered *for particular offences* only ; whereas his was at once to purge from all.

As to St. John's practice, Origen, one of the most learned of the ancients, says expressly on the passage ; ' We ought necessarily to observe, that both St. Matthew and St. Mark say, that upon confessing their sins, all Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan, or all the country of Judæa, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, were baptized. But St. Matthew brings in the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to be baptized, but not confessing their sins ; and for this reason they are called *a generation of vipers*.<sup>f</sup> And a little after, he adds, ' The Pharisees and Sadducees were different from those who confessed their sins<sup>g</sup>. ' Plainly intimating, that all those who were before said to be baptized, were also said to confess their sins.

Besides, St. John's baptism was the baptism of repentance : so St. Paul teaches the Ephesians, Acts xix. 4, *John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance*, and therefore St. John himself refuses to baptize the Pharisees, &c., directing them to *bring forth fruits meet for repentance*, Matth. iii. 8. Now, that can never be a baptism of repentance which is given to those who do not repent. St. John therefore could no more administer this baptism to infants who could not, than to the Pharisees who would not repent. If you consider this impartially, sir, I am persuaded you will see reason to believe St. John baptized only adult persons : from whence it will follow, that since his practice is allowed to be our precedent, we are bound to do the same.

4. But in the last place, to fix the matter entirely, this custom of the Jews to initiate all proselytes and their children by baptism, allowing the fact to be ever so certain, was at best only a traditional ceremony from the rabbins ; and though our author thinks fit to correct Mr. Stennet for saying so, yet that gentleman's short argument, that ' no such initiation is commanded in the law of God<sup>h</sup>, ' will overbear all he has there said about it.

To suppose the tradition of their elders of any authority to prove the divine institution of that ceremony, is very weak and trifling ;

<sup>f</sup> In Johan. p. 118 D. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγκαῖον ἡμῶς παραθέσθαι, ὅτι ἀμφότεροι μὲν, ὅ τε Ματθαῖος, καὶ ὁ Μάρκος ἐξομολογουμένους τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν φασὶ βαπτίζεσθαι, πᾶσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰωρδάνου, ἢ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν χώραν, καὶ τοὺς Ἱεροσολυμίτας πάντας· ὁ δὲ Ματθαῖος εἰσάγει μὲν ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τοὺς Φαρισαίους, καὶ Σαδδουκαίους, οὐ μὴν ἐξομο-

λογουμένους τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν· διόπερ εἰκὸς καὶ τοῦτο εὐλογον εἶναι αἴτιον τοῦ ἀκηκοέναι αὐτοὺς γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν. [Comm. lib. vi. sect. 14.—Op. tom. iv. p. 127. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>g</sup> Pag. 119 D. Ἐτέροις οὖσιν παρὰ τοὺς ἐξομολογουμένους τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. [Sect. xiv. tom. iv. p. 128 A. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>h</sup> Introd. p. 28. [26.]



and Mr. Wall would be far from allowing all the consequences of such a supposition.

But he says, 'They quoted texts in the law of God for what they did!.' And what then? Is it therefore a divine institution, because they pretend this or the other text favours it? And will our author himself acquiesce in all they bring Scripture to vouch? They may cite the whole Bible, though not a word in it makes for them; and yet, according to Mr. Wall, the thing is well enough proved, as long as they cite so good authority.

But I am inclined to think, the Jews were not so much out in the texts they cite, as our author is, in imagining they grounded their baptism of proselytes on them. I have already shewn the Scriptures mention no such baptism of proselytes, and that therefore it was only a tradition: the rabbins themselves tacitly confess this, in arguing from the legal washings; and expressly in that very determination of the dispute between rabbi Eliezer and rabbi Joshua, which our antagonists constantly quote, in these words: 'But the wise men pronounced, that till he were both circumcised and baptized, he was not a proselyte<sup>k</sup>.' For this makes it appear they derived the practice only from the authority of their elders.

That this is a just inference from the words cannot be questioned, if we observe, that the Jews make a common distinction between the pollutions and purifications expressed in the law, and those which are not expressed there, but have their obligation from the authority and constitutions of the rabbins. Thus the great Maimonides says, 'The uncleannesses I have expounded are all from the law, and are therefore called pollutions which depend on the words of the law: but there are, besides these, several other pollutions, which are decreed to be so by the authority of the rabbins only; and are therefore called pollutions grounded on the determinations of the rabbins!'

In other passages of the same preface he carefully preserves this distinction, and frequently notes, that this or the other 'pollution arises from the determinations of the doctors;' and 'this is unclean only because the scribes have decreed so,' &c.

The same observation holds good likewise in other cases besides this of pollutions: but I instance in this, because it seems homogeneous to the matter in dispute; and in the Talmud, you see, the baptism or purification of proselytes is bottomed on the authority of the wise men; for since it is plain the Jews have added many

<sup>i</sup> Introd. [p. 26.]

<sup>k</sup> Talmud. Jebamoth. cap. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Præfat. in Seder. Taharoth.

things to those determined in the law, and particularly in the matter of washings, and since we find no footsteps of any such baptism in the Scriptures, it is natural to believe it was instituted only by the rabbins, and that when the Talmud attributes it to the wise men, it means so.

Maimonides expressly assures us, this is the proper design and meaning of that Talmudical phrase: for shewing the sanction of each constitution in the Talmud, he distributes them into five classes. ‘The first contains those things which were received from Moses, and have some foundation, and may be concluded from the sacred text, &c. The second class comprehends those things which are denominated Constitutions of Moses from Sinai, but cannot be proved or collected by any argument from the Scriptures, &c. The third comprehends those which are drawn from argumentation only, and which are disputed; in which cases, the opinion of the majority takes place,’ &c.—And these things, he says, are known in the Talmud by these distinguishing phrases, ‘*N.* says thus, for this reason; and *N.* says thus, for this reason.

‘But if any one should think these things, which admit of dispute, were received by tradition from Moses, and that the dispute arose from forgetfulness or mistake, so that one side is right, but the other either mistook the sense, or forgot some part, or else did not learn of his doctor all he ought to have learned——this is very unhandsome and absurd, and for want of knowing things, and the foundations of them, mightily detracts from the reputation of those men who have delivered to us the traditions. It is therefore altogether false, and arises from——and their not distinguishing between those things which are received by tradition, and those which are only inferences from them. But whatever else thou doubtest of, lay down this as a certain rule, that whenever thou findest a difference between the disciples of Shammai and the disciples of Hillel——neither what one nor the other asserts was derived by tradition from Moses, nor spoken from Mount Sinai<sup>m</sup>.’

And therefore since R. Eliezer and R. Joshua do controvert the baptism of proselytes, it cannot be thought a tradition from Moses, but only an inference of the later rabbins, drawn from some other principles, and not capable of being proved from the Scriptures, neither expressly nor by consequence; for this Maimonides notes as the property of the first class only.

‘The fourth class,’ he says, ‘contains the decrees and determi-

'nations of the prophets and wise men—which they call *constitutions*.—That thou shalt not eat the flesh of a bird with milk, 'is a constitution of our doctors, to keep men at a greater distance 'from transgression; for whereas the law only prohibited the flesh 'of some beasts, the wise men, to keep us at a greater distance 'from that which the law makes unlawful, forbid also birds,' &c.—And this kind of constitutions, when they are of general use, he determines out of the Talmud, that even Elias himself, to whom they refer all things, has not power to alter or abolish in any one single point.

'But the fifth and last class,' he says, 'is of those things which 'may be of use to men, in order to the observation of the precepts 'of the law.——Of this sort of constitutions there are very many 'in the Talmud and Mischna—and some are the constitutions of 'particular wise men; as when it is said Hillel determined, or our 'master Gamaliel determined, or R. John the son of Zacchæus 'determined, &c.—Others again are constitutions of the whole 'body; as when it is said, it was agreed in Usa; the wise men 'pronounced; or it is a constitution of the wise men.' And of this nature exactly is the case of baptizing proselytes; for the Talmud ushers in the tradition thus: 'The wise men pronounced,' &c.

Hence you see, sir, the baptism of proselytes is built on this last authority, which is the lowest of all. And if Maimonides understood the sense of their own Talmud, which I believe no man ever did better; then the Talmud founds this baptism not on the law, nor on any tradition from Moses, but only on the judgments and determinations of their rabbins; which reduces the main basis of infant-baptism to nothing else but a mere rabbinical tradition.

They cite indeed Exod. xix. 10, as Mr. Wall objects; but I have before shewn<sup>n</sup>, it does not prove the thing Mr. Wall thinks it is cited for. Besides, it seems plainly to have been cited only by way of accommodation, not that they believed there was any argument in it: and this method was usual with the Jews. For, what Dr. Pococke says concerning their custom of washing their hands, is very applicable to the present case: 'Though they endeavour to 'find some foundation in the law for this rite, and refer to those 'words, Lev. xv. 11, (or in our case, Exod. xix. 10,) this is but an 'insufficient kind of proof, and they themselves confess it is only 'derived from the authority of their doctors<sup>o</sup>.'

<sup>n</sup> Page 234, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Not. Miscell. cap. ix. p. 385. Quam-

vis enim ritum istum aliquo modo in lege fundari volunt, et ad verba ista לא ידעו

If then this be the state of the case; supposing this baptism had been practised in our Saviour's time, it is great presumption in our adversaries to draw it into a precedent for the Christian church, and to corrupt the pure institutions of Christ with the fancies of the rabbins: especially after our Lord has strictly cautioned us, as well as his disciples, to *beware of the leaven of the Pharisees*.

For it is to be observed, the traditions our Lord condemns were such particularly as related to washings: which shews, that corruptions had crept into those things; and therefore it is probable, if there was any such baptism, it was introduced with these inventions. And our Lord, by condemning their traditions, certainly intended, neither that, nor any part of them should be continued without his particular injunction; nor would his disciples have ventured to retain it on any pretence whatever. And it is very strange that any, but especially so many learned and judicious men among the pædobaptists, should so easily persuade themselves to follow this unwarrantable method, notwithstanding Christ so clearly disallows it, and they know at the same time what a faithless sort of men the rabbins are, on whom they depend.

Thus I have proved from many considerations that the arguments of our adversaries do not make it appear to have been the custom of the Jews at our Saviour's time to baptize proselytes and their children. I have also added several arguments which do with great probability evince the contrary. I have likewise shewn, that even supposing the fact could be demonstrated, it is no rule to us in the administration of a Christian sacrament, as being only a tradition of their elders, and not grounded on Scripture, nor derived from Moses. And this cuts off one great part of the pretended evidence for infant-baptism, and effectually everts what they call the 'main basis' of it. The other kind of evidence Mr. Wall produces, viz. the authority of the Fathers, is next to be considered. In the mean time, I am,

Sir, &c.

שטף במים *et manus suas non laverit*,  
Levit. xv. 11, referant, non est hoc tamen  
aliud quam אסמכתא בעלמא *Probatio*

שאינו אלא מרובנן *non*  
*alunde quam a doctoribus profectum fa-*  
*tentur, &c.*



## LETTER XI.

WHAT is to be the particular business of the following letters—The authority of the primitive Fathers more to be valued than Daillé and some others suppose—It would be easy to defend the credit of the Fathers from the cavils of these men—They were, doubtless, faithful in the relations they were well qualified to give of affairs in their own churches and times—And so far their authority is of consequence—But yet this is not sufficient to ground Mr. Wall's attempt upon, though they should afford ever so many full citations—They were sometimes in the wrong—The two only ways to prove infant-baptism are insufficient, even though the arguments our adversaries make use of be allowed all the force they are pretended to have—It is probable the earliest churches practised only what they received from the apostles—Mr. Wall takes no notice of St. Barnabas, because he makes against infant-baptism in several places—The passages from St. Clement examined—Mr. Wall's argument from them stated—The main point on which it turns, a groundless mistake, viz. that baptism is necessary universally to all that shall be saved—Baptism does not appear to have been designed to wash away original sin—By this same argument, it might as certainly be proved, that all the antipædobaptists now are for infant-baptism—The passages from Hermas considered—In the passages cited, this Father speaks only of adult persons—John iii. 5. considered—Kingdom of God does not necessarily mean the kingdom of glory—The words cannot be taken universally—*Tis* has no relation to infants in any place of Scripture—And here relates only to the subjects of whom our Lord speaks—Who are only adult persons who have heard the word preached—As appears, 1. Because such only can be expected to comply with the institution, to whom only it is truly given—2. Because such only can be saved by it, according to St. Peter—Whose words the pædobaptists have never yet fairly interpreted—Dr. Whitby's evasion considered—3. The same form of speech usual, when infants are not included; as they seem not to be in this place by our Saviour's words in the context—4. The words under consideration cannot be true of infants—5. Something in the words themselves limits them to adult persons—What it is to be born of the Spirit—Dr. Whitby's judicious observations on the text—Another passage of Hermas considered—He only describes visions, and therefore is not always to be taken literally—He cannot mean, that persons in their separate state were or could be baptized with material water—He says nothing however of infant-baptism; but rather excludes infants in this very passage—Besides, to give up all our adversaries can reasonably desire here, it would only prove infants shall be baptized in their separate estate after death, which is nothing to our dispute—Another passage of Hermas—That infants are esteemed of God, no argument they ought to be baptized—This passage makes rather against infant-baptism—Hermas says several things inconsistent with it—Matt. xix. 14. considered—It has no relation to baptism—Dr. Whitby's improvement of the passage examined—It is probable the children were brought to be healed—It does not follow from these words, that they are fit to be dedicated to Christ by baptism—The bishop of Salisbury's assertion noted, and disproved—Conclusion.

You may remember, sir, that Mr. Wall allows there are but two ways to establish the credit and divine authority of infant-baptism : viz. to ascertain the practice of the Jews in Christ's time ; and of the primitive church immediately after.

The practice of the Jews, in relation to this point, was the subject of my last letter : all I have further to add is, to shew, that it does not appear that the Christians of the first ages did practise infant-baptism, and that the writings of the Fathers of those times do not countenance it in the least. And when this is done, Mr. Wall's concession gives up the cause, and the patrons of infant-baptism should honestly renounce their error, or else produce some better arguments on their side.

To all that is usually built on the credit of the Fathers, some take the shortest way, and answer by rejecting their authority ; and Daillé, who has observed no moderation towards those good men in another case, has lent such disputants a helping hand to destroy their reputation. It is an ill return for the great lessons and examples of piety they have given us, and for their having been so instrumental in transmitting to us the knowledge of our most holy religion. And there is yet a greater evil attends this method ; for all the abuses and affronts put upon the Fathers of the first centuries do in the end reflect on Christianity itself, which those great men have handed down, and which therefore must needs be, in some degree, of but doubtful authority if it depends on insufficient testimonies.

It would not be difficult to defend the writings of the Fathers from the reproaches cast on them by these men, and by Daillé their oracle, notwithstanding he has taken such pains in the matter, and pushed it with all the vigour he could. But it is a nice subject, and much too copious to be treated here at large. I shall therefore only say, that in many cases, the rejecting the authority of the Fathers is a very wild extreme ; which men are driven to, only because they have nothing better to say for themselves, and cannot brook to see their opinions contradicted in their writings.

That the Fathers of the first churches were honest faithful men, and every way capable to acquaint us with the true posture of affairs in their own churches and times, and therefore are to be depended on as far as they relate facts within their proper cognizance, must be allowed on all hands ; and I do not see how their greatest enemies can have the face to deny this : and Mr. Wall pretends to make no further use of their authority in the present dispute, than

to shew what was the opinion or practice of the churches where they presided, and of the times when they wrote.

However, Mr. Wall's argument from the Fathers turns upon a supposition which cannot easily be granted him; viz. that the primitive church believed and practised nothing but what they had received from the apostles themselves. For what can he mean by endeavouring to prove, the church of the first three centuries practised infant-baptism? unless at the same time he imagines their practice a sufficient argument of its divine institution. And if our author had ventured to lay down this principle so formally as I have expressed it, every one, though ever so little acquainted with ecclesiastical history, would have been able to judge of the weakness of it.

But, without any reflection on the honour and fidelity of the Fathers, their testimonies cannot support infant-baptism, though they should afford our author ever so many and full citations; for if the Fathers only prove *fact* in the church, and not *right*, and the church was not wholly pure from innovations; how does this prove the baptism of infants was no innovation, but an institution of Christ? And yet this is the thing our author should have done, though he takes no notice of it.

It is irksome to remember the instances of human frailty which even the most ancient church was liable to; they were men subject to like passions with us, and therefore no wonder they were sometimes in the wrong; and their zeal for God's honour was not always according to knowledge; which, though it might keep them from losing the chief thing our Lord had commanded, might however expose them to the inconveniency of superadding several things he never authorized. The apostles undoubtedly kept close to his directions in all things, without deviation either in defect or excess; for they had the immediate assistance, in a most extraordinary manner, of the Spirit of God; 'But that the Christians of the very next age made several additions,' Tertullian confesses in his book *de Corona*<sup>a</sup>. And Eusebius, from Hegesippus, notes that 'the church continued all the apostles' times a pure virgin undefiled—But 'when those holy men were dead—then errors began to arise 'through the mistakes of other teachers<sup>b</sup>.' And therefore in the

<sup>a</sup> Rigaltius in Cyprian. Epist. lxiv. p. 279 b. At Christianos ævi proxime sequentis addidisse pluscula, fatetur Tertullianus libro de Corona. [p. 158. edit. Fell.]

<sup>b</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 32. 'Ὡς ἄρα

μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρά καὶ ἀδιάφορος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία.—'Ὡς δὲ ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς διάφορον εἰλήφει τοῦ βίου τέλος.—τηνικαὶτα τῆς ἀθέου πλάνης τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλάβανεν ἡ σύστασις διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης.



present dispute between us and the pædobaptists, though our author should prove with all imaginable evidence that the churches did, immediately after the apostles, practise infant-baptism; it will be no proof that infant-baptism was instituted by Christ, or practised by his apostles; because it remains a very material question, whether it was derived from them, or only began with some other things after their death? And this objection our author has taken no care to guard against, though we may suppose he could not be ignorant that the primitive churches were liable to innovations, and did actually admit several.

Though this might be very justly insisted on against our adversaries, yet I will give them all the advantages they can desire: and therefore I will grant it is however probable, that what all or most of the earliest churches practised immediately after the apostles' times, had been appointed or practised by the apostles themselves, and was derived from them; for it is hardly to be imagined, that any considerable body of those ancient Christians, and much less that the whole or a great part of the church, should so soon deviate from the customs and injunctions of their venerable founders, whose authority they held so sacred. And besides, new opinions or practices, we see, are usually introduced by degrees, and not at once, nor without opposition; therefore in regard to baptism in particular, a thing of such universal concern and daily practice, I allow it to be very probable that the primitive churches kept to the apostles' pattern. But then I desire it may also be considered, that this, though ever so probable, cannot be fairly made equivalent to the authority of the Scriptures: so that, if it can be proved from the Scriptures to be but likewise so much as probable, that the apostles did not baptize infants (which, I think, I have already shewn); that other probability, drawn from the writings of the Fathers, ought not to be urged against us. However, I am to suppose here, (as indeed I verily believe,) that the primitive church maintained, in this case, an exact conformity to the practice of the apostles, which, doubtless, entirely agreed with Christ's institution; and I might venture to put the whole matter upon this issue. Nay further, since Mr. Wall is desirous to have it thought *impossible*<sup>c</sup> the church should so early be ignorant of, or vary from, the practice of the apostles in so notorious an affair as that of baptism, I will for once grant him that too; so that now the whole question is reduced to this, Whether it can be proved from the authentic pieces of the primitive Fathers, that the church used infant-baptism in those earliest times?

<sup>c</sup> Part i. p. 21. [50.]



And if this cannot be proved, then upon our author's own principles, that practice is nowhere grounded on so much as one small probability. But let us see how Mr. Wall has acquitted himself in his attempt.

No other reason that I know of can be given why he does not begin with St. Barnabas, but that instead of favouring the baptism of infants, his epistle contains at least a passage or two utterly inconsistent with it; however, had our author been true to his promise, he should no more have omitted these passages *against*, than any others he thinks *for* his purpose. In one place St. Barnabas, explaining what was meant by the milk and honey which used to be given to the new-baptized, says thus; 'Because, as the child is nourished first with honey, and then with milk; so we, being strengthened and kept alive with the belief of his promises and the word, shall live and have dominion over the earth<sup>d</sup>.' Which words necessarily signify,

1. That the milk and honey was given to every one who was baptized; as might be largely proved. And,

2. That the word of God, and faith in his promises, were the spiritual food with which all those new-born babes in Christianity were nourished and fed; from whence it must unavoidably follow, that according to St. Barnabas, all persons who were admitted to baptism in his time were capable of feeding on the word and promises of God by faith, and infants doubtless could not be of this number. This he expressly tells us was the design of those symbols, and therefore it must needs appear very improper and absurd to use the sign where the thing signified cannot take place; and to suppose St. Barnabas guilty of this, is to suppose him capable of an absurdity. The same holy writer, speaking in another place of all who were baptized, has this charitable assertion, 'That we go down into the water full of sins and pollution; but come up again bringing forth fruit in our hearts, and having the fear and hope which is in Jesus in our spirit<sup>e</sup>.' Though these words are not to be so interpreted that every one who is baptized is infallibly renewed; yet they cannot mean less than that it is to be hoped in charity they all rise up out of the water of baptism, having in their hearts 'the fear and hope which is in Jesus.' Barnabas plainly meant so; and therefore since infants are not capable of this, of

<sup>d</sup> Cap. vi. "Οτι πρῶτον τὸ παιδίον μέλιτι, εἶτα γάλακτι ζωοποιεῖται. Οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ πίστει τῆς ἐπαγγελίας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ζωοποιούμενοι, ζήσομεν, κατακυριεύοντες τῇ γῆς.

<sup>e</sup> Cap. xi. fin. "Οτι ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνοντες καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τὸν φόβον καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἡχοντες ἐν τῷ πνεύματι.

consequence he knew nothing of their baptism, nor thought them fit for it.

Mr. Wall, however, does not go about to argue from this Father; but begins his collection with two passages foreign to this purpose in St. Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians, which, according to himself, only prove the infection of Adam's sin on all his posterity. And neither of the passages is plain even to prove this: for, in the first, St. Clement is exhorting the Corinthians to humility, among other things, from the examples of Abraham, Job, and Moses, who, though such great things were said of them, yet spoke very meanly of themselves; but St. Clement says nothing of original sin, nor seems to have had the least thought of it. The other passage, as every one who reads it will see, has likewise no relation to original sin; the words indeed may be strained to that sense, but there is no plain mention of it, nor any circumstance which makes it necessary to understand them so. On the contrary, since St. Clement subjoins this inference from all he had been saying, immediately after the words Mr. Wall has cited; 'Wherefore, having received all these things from him, we ought 'on all occasions to give him thanks<sup>f</sup>:' we must needs think he had not been speaking of original sin, for that we cannot receive from God, who is not the author of sin: nor are we bound to give thanks to God for it; for this would be great impiety.

Besides, supposing St. Clement does speak of original sin, what is that to infant-baptism? The force of this is altogether invisible to me, nor can I possibly unravel our author's meaning in it, unless it be this: St. Clement asserts original sin is propagated to all the posterity of Adam: no man can be saved from it but by Christ, and no man can be saved by Christ unless he be baptized; therefore none can be saved from original sin unless they are baptized: but God intended all, as well infants as others, should be saved from original sin; and therefore God designed all, as well infants as others, should be baptized.

I think I have done our author all the justice in the world, in this representation of his argument, which I have stated to the best advantage I could, and yet it is easy to see how weak and inconclusive it is: for the words he had cited, according to his own pretence, only prove that St. Clement believed the notion of original sin; but the other links of the chain are wholly our author's.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 38. fin. Ταῦτα οὖν πάντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες, ἀφείλομεν κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ.

2. If these arbitrary suppositions were all really St. Clement's, they would then only shew what was St. Clement's opinion in this case: whereas our author is to shew what was the practice of the church of that time, and not the sentiments of one single man only; for he himself confesses, that 'the testimony of any of the Fathers 'is not so much to be regarded as it speaks their own sense, as it is 'for that it gives us an evidence of what was then believed, taught, 'or practised in the church.'

3. The main point, upon which the whole argument turns, is nothing but a groundless and uncharitable error. If none can be saved but such as are baptized into Christ, then all the Gentile world, whose ignorance God was pleased to wink at, must be irrecoverably lost: and it might with as much reason be argued, that even all mankind, from the creation to Christ's death, for above four thousand years, without excepting Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, David, and all the holy prophets, must also be for ever lost, for want of baptism which was not then instituted, as that children cannot be saved without baptism, which was not instituted for them. So dreadful are the consequences of that wild notion, which is directly contrary to the doctrine of Christ himself, who more than once said, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*, &c., to persons not baptized. But our author is guilty of another mistake, which likewise flows from the former, viz. that baptism is to cleanse from original sin, and that original sin cannot be forgiven without it. But baptism, we may answer, was not so much intended for the remission of original, as of actual sins: for, 1. The Scripture only teaches us to expect the remission of our actual sins upon our baptism. 2. We see infants who are sprinkled are as much, and as early inclined to vice; and others, though ever so regularly baptized, are liable to the same inconveniences, entailed by Adam's sin on his posterity, as well as the rest of mankind, though not in the same degree: whereas, had baptism been designed entirely to wash away the effects and consequences of original sin, then all who are baptized should be as perfectly free from those things as Adam was in innocence; for what else does the remission of sin mean, but being cleared from the imputation of guilt, and delivered from the curse and punishment of it? And since we are convinced by the experience of one thousand seven hundred years, we must either say baptism is a vain, impotent ceremony, which God forbid! or else grant that it was never designed to purge us from all the conse-

quences of original sin ; it being impossible at the same time both to be absolutely free from them, and to suffer them.

The pædobaptists are at a loss to determine what else children should be baptized for ; who cannot be baptized for the remission of actual sins, because they have none : and since baptism is for the remission of some sin, rather than alter their practice they pretend it must be for original sin, but I have shewn it does not appear to cleanse from that ; and if then children are not baptized for actual nor original sin, it necessarily follows that they are not to be baptized at all.

There is this further absurdity in the argument, from the primitive Church's owning original sin : that if, because they believed this, it must be inferred they believed that all persons, infants not excepted, were to be baptized, and that they did actually baptize them on that ground only ; then it may as well follow, that even all the antipædobaptists in England, who do also firmly believe and profess the same notion of original sin, do likewise acknowledge and practise the baptism of infants too : for it no more follows that St. Clement, &c., were anciently for infant-baptism, than that the modern antipædobaptists are so now ; since these own the doctrine of original sin as well as the others.

Mr. Wall passes, in the next place, to St. Hermas, who maintaining the necessity of water-baptism to the salvation of believers, uses some expressions from whence our author gathers, that he and the church of that time practised infant-baptism. The force of the first passage he mentions depends entirely upon this sentence, ‘The tower is represented to be built upon the water, because your life is saved, and shall be saved by water.’ And from this he would infer, that none of any age or condition can be saved without baptism ; and if the church thought so, it cannot indeed be doubted, but the tenderness of the first Christians prevailed on them to baptize their children : this is Mr. Wall's meaning, though he has not given it so distinctly. But, 1. It may be noted, here is no plain intimation in St. Hermas, that none could be saved who were not baptized, though he seems to make it necessary in some cases. 2. He is speaking of building the church triumphant out of the church militant, which indeed is built on the water of baptism ; but still he nowhere supposes, that none can be saved who are not members of the church militant on earth, or that all ages, any more than all conditions, are fit to be admitted into fellowship. 3. The stones of which he is building the visionary fabric, are only adult persons ; whence it is clear his words can have no relation to infants ; and



therefore if they were to be fitted into the structure, it must be by some other means. All the stones, not only those which were employed in the building, but which were rejected too, are thus enumerated by him according to their different kind: 'Some were 'bright square stones; some were drawn out of the deep; others were 'taken off' from the ground; and of these some were rejected, and 'some were fitted into the building; some were cut out and cast at 'a distance from the tower. There were likewise many other stones 'lying about the building, which were not made use of; some of which 'were very rough, others were cracked, others were white and round, 'not proper for building the tower. Besides these, I saw likewise 'other stones, which were cast at a distance from the tower, and 'fell into the way, but did not continue there, but were rolled 'off into a desert place. Others fell into the fire, and were burnt. 'Others again falling by the water, endeavoured to roll into it, but 'could not<sup>h</sup>.' Now, if in all this variety infants are not comprehended, then I think it must be allowed that what St. Hermas says of these stones, or the building they compiled, cannot be fairly applied to infants. And, if we may judge of his meaning by his explication, it is past all doubt that infants are entirely excluded. For by those bright square stones laid in the foundation, he means the apostles and bishops, and doctors and ministers<sup>i</sup>: by those taken out of the deep, are signified 'those who are already fallen asleep, 'and have suffered for the name of the Lord. They which lie on 'the ground and are not polished are those which God has 'approved; because they have entered the law of the Lord, and 'directed their way according to his commandments. But they 'which are brought, and put into the building of the tower, are the 'young in faith, and the faithful<sup>k</sup>.' By those that were rejected and laid by the tower, are represented 'such as having sinned 'are willing to repent<sup>l</sup>:' by those that are cut out and cast at a distance, are meant 'the children of iniquity, who believed only 'hypocritically, and their wickedness is not departed from them<sup>m</sup>.' The rugged stones are 'they that have known the truth, but have 'not continued in it, nor been joined to the saints<sup>n</sup>.' The cracked stones are 'they who keep discord in their hearts against one 'another<sup>o</sup>.' The short stones are 'they who have believed indeed, 'but still retain much of their wickedness<sup>p</sup>.' The white and round stones are 'such as have faith, but have also the riches of this 'present world<sup>q</sup>.' The stones which are rolled out of the way into

<sup>h</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 3. cap. 2. fin.  
<sup>m</sup> Ibid. cap. 6.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. cap. 5.  
<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid.  
<sup>p</sup> Ibid.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid.  
<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

desert places signify ‘such as have believed, but through doubting ‘have forsaken the true way.’ Those which fell into the fire are ‘they who have for ever departed from the living God; nor has it ‘any more entered into their hearts to repent, because of their ‘lusts.’ They that could not roll into the water are ‘such as have ‘heard the word, and were willing to be baptized in the name of ‘the Lord; but when they considered what holiness the truth required, they have drawn back, and walked again according to their ‘own wicked lusts.’ Thus it is evident, all the stones, which St. Hermas here speaks of, represent only adult persons, and particularly such of them as have heard and believed; and therefore what he says of these should not be wrested and referred to any other.

And as he is only speaking of such persons as have believed or heard the word preached, it must be to such only he is to be understood to make baptism necessary. And therefore our author should not have asserted from this place that St. Hermas believed, ‘Baptism with water is appointed the sacrament of salvation ‘to such as are saved;’ but only ‘to such as believe or have heard ‘the word preached.’ And to such indeed we readily grant baptism is to be administered, in order to their salvation, according to the terms of the Gospel; but it will not follow that infants too ought to be baptized, nor that the primitive church thought so.

Our author has as little ground to assert, that his inference will more plainly appear to be agreeable to St. Hermas’ meaning, from the next passage he recites: for what has been already observed on the other may be applied to this. It is a vision much like the former; and the substance and design of it are exactly the same, viz. under the emblem of a tower to represent the building of the church with such stones as only signify adult persons.

Mr. Wall makes two observations on the words he recites. First, he would from hence fix the sense of John iii. 5. For St. Hermas having said, ‘Before any one receives the name of ‘the Son of God, he is liable to death; but when he receives the ‘seal, he is freed from death, and delivered to life; now that seal is ‘water,’ &c.; and using other expressions to signify the necessity of this seal to salvation; Mr. Wall undertakes to tell us, either that this passage proves the words in St. John mean, that none can be saved without baptism; or that the words in St. John prove these in St. Hermas mean so. He has left it a little doubtful which he intends; but one he certainly means, or he means nothing:

<sup>r</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 3. cap. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid.

<sup>u</sup> Part i. p. 3. [30.]

<sup>x</sup> Ibid.

for as to the present controversy, what would it signify to know the sense of either of those writers, if it is not supposed to affect our cause? But our author, we may see, understands both St. John and St. Hermas to say, that baptism is necessary to the salvation of all without exception; and by comparing the two passages he must mean, that one proves and confirms this to be the sense of the other. And by putting us in mind that St. John wrote his Gospel after St. Hermas had wrote this book, he seems to import that St. John is to be supposed to copy those words from St. Hermas: but other people who consider that St. John repeats them as the words of Christ, who was crucified above thirty-five years before St. Hermas wrote, will believe St. John had no respect to this passage of St. Hermas, and only relates what he had *heard and seen with his eyes*, &c., and therefore the two places are not the same as Mr. Wall would insinuate.

St. Hermas' expressions can refer only to adult persons, to whom the word may and ought to be preached; for upon the necessity he has been speaking of, he says, 'for which reason to these also 'was this seal preached,' &c. Whoever are understood in these words, he makes preaching to them full as necessary as their being baptized.

Our Saviour's words, as recorded by St. John, have nothing in them which can at all favour the baptism of infants: but because Mr. Wall here and elsewhere as well as other pædobaptists, argues from them, I will take this occasion to examine them a little.

It is very readily allowed him, that *τις* here, as *ἄνθρωπος*, 1 Cor. xi. 28, does mean *any one*, or if he please *every one*; and therefore we will render the original of St. John thus, with the utmost extension, *Except every one be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.*

By *kingdom of God*, our author supposes must be meant, 'the 'kingdom of glory hereafter in heavenly;' and backs it with a very indifferent observation of St. Austin, viz. that its being said, ver. 3, *cannot see the kingdom of God*, instead of what is afterwards expressed by *cannot enter*, &c., clearly shews the words do not mean the church; 'for one that is not baptized may *see the church*. It is 'therefore plainly meant of the kingdom of glory.'

But how frivolous and unfair is this! for Mr. Wall cannot but know, that the word *see*, in this and many such places, is no more to be understood of a *physical* sight by means of the bodily eye, than it is in Matt. v. 8, where it is said of the pure in heart that

*they shall see God, whom yet no man hath seen nor can see*<sup>z</sup> with bodily eyes; but it shall be in a manner vastly more glorious and wonderful, and more suitable to his infinite perfections and nature. The instances of this metaphorical use of the word are too numerous to leave our author any excuse.

But all the ancients do understand by *kingdom of God*, in this text, ‘the kingdom of glory<sup>a</sup>,’ says our author. Yet this may not be the true sense, if they do; for the ancients were fallible, and often gave sufficient proof of it by the strange interpretations they made: their opinions are not to be urged as always true, but only to shew us what was the opinion and practice of the times they lived in. And our author does not go about to prove his assertion; but cites, in a scornful way, the right reverend expositor of the Thirty-Nine Articles, as acknowledging the truth of it, though he attempts to give the words another turn. But his lordship asserts only, ‘that very early some doctrines arose upon baptism, that we ‘cannot be determined by. The words of our Saviour to Nicodemus were expounded so<sup>b</sup>,’ &c. And after infant-baptism came to some head, then indeed this was much insisted on; and the authorities Mr. Wall makes use of, in reference to this text, are, I think, all too late, and of those centuries wherein pædobaptism and many other abuses are known to have prevailed. If he had cited the writers of the first three centuries, it had been considerable; but what is it to me how St. Austin, Fulgentius, Gregory, Driedo, Lombard, Ales, and the rest of the schoolmen, determine in the matter?

Mr. Wall has not offered to confute those words of his lordship, wherein he is pleased to let us into the ground of his sense of this text. By *the kingdom of God*, may well be understood the church or dispensation of the Messias, when, as his lordship unanswerably argues, ‘that is the sense in which the kingdom of God does stand, ‘almost universally through the whole Gospel<sup>c</sup>.’ Now into this kingdom we allow that persons can regularly enter no other way but by baptism. And upon this sense of the phrase Dr. Whitby argues, ‘that no man is indeed a member of Christ’s kingdom, who ‘is not truly regenerate:’ which he strengthens with these words of Christ, John viii. 31, *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed.* But if this interpretation be true, our author tells you the antipædobaptists gain nothing by it, ‘since the only way, ‘at least the only known and ordinary way, to the kingdom of

<sup>z</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 16.

<sup>b</sup> [On Art. xxvii. p. 303. in edit. 1699.]

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. p. 124. [445.]

<sup>c</sup> Page 301.



'glory is by being of Christ's church<sup>d</sup>.' As if a person had no more to do, but to get into the church by baptism, and he would be safe enough; for no more can be needful to make him safe but to get into the *only way*. And, as if a man, on the other hand, though ever so innocent and exact in all things else, could nevertheless have no salvation, only for want of a ceremony he is utterly a stranger to, or cannot attain. I do not know where our author learned this charitable divinity; for I am sure neither the Scriptures nor the light of nature teach any such dreadful doctrines.

However, taking his sense of the place, what will our adversaries gain by it? No less they pretend than the whole matter in dispute: for then they imagine the argument will be very plain. The stress of it lies in the comprehensiveness of the particle *τις*, which they suppose necessarily includes *all*; than which nothing in the world can be more false. For *τις* is not an universal, but an indefinite; and therefore should not be understood universally. But if, because it is indefinite, it must therefore here comprehend *all*, for want of limitation, then it may as well be said to take in the whole animal creation, nay and towns and cities too: for we find *τις* so far from being appropriated to signify the species of men only, that it is frequently enough used for brute beasts, and inanimate things: and since Mr. Wall will doubtless exclude them from being intended, for the very same reasons we shall insist upon excluding of infants.

There is nothing in the particle *τις* which necessarily determines us to apply these words to infants. *Ἀνθρώπος*, 1 Cor. xi. 28, is synonymous with *τις*, ver. 34, of the same chapter; and yet infants cannot be thought to be included in it there, and there is no more reason they should in the place under consideration. Again, Mark xi. 25, *Forgive, if ye have ought against any*, &c.; and chap. viii. 26, *nor tell it to any in the town*. And so, as far as I remember, in all other places of Scripture where it occurs, it plainly has no relation to infants at all, nor can possibly be applied to them. And therefore, notwithstanding its indefinite meaning, there are at least very many cases, among which we justly place John iii. 5, in which the particle is not capable of such a lax and general acceptance; nay, there are several instances where it is directly opposed to words of so comprehensive a sense. Thucydides says, 'that the Athenians 'falling on (*τισὶν*, a small party,) not many of the Syracusians, and 'killing some, (*τινὰς*,) erected a trophy, and returned back<sup>e</sup>.' And

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. p. 125. [446.]

<sup>e</sup> Bell. Peloponnesiac. lib. vi. cap. 94.  
Καὶ τῶν Συρακουσίων περιτυχόντες τισὶν οὐ

πολλοῖς, καὶ ἀποκτείναντές τε τινὰς, καὶ τροπαῖον στήσαντες ἀνεχώρησαν ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς.

in this same sentence, the particle is used to express but *some* of the *few* mentioned before; for they killed not all the few they fell on, but *some* of them only. And why then should any from the force of this word argue, that all without exception must be baptized, or they cannot be saved?

If it be said, that though *τις* does not signify all, yet since it means *any one*, or *more*, indefinitely, in all such forms of speech as this before us, it does not come short of an universal; for the proposition here being negative, it denies *any* can be saved without being baptized; which makes our Saviour's words amount to this universal negative, that *none but those who are born again can enter into the kingdom of God*.

To this I answer, that it proceeds wholly on that false supposition, that *τις* necessarily intends *any one* so universally, as to extend to *all* men, women, and children. I do not know of any one instance where the particle is so used: on the contrary, I have given some, and could easily have added many more, where it undoubtedly does not extend so far. And yet unless it does in John iii. 5, they cannot infer that our Saviour's negative affects all of them, but only the subjects spoken of in the place; for at most, it is only said, none of those can be saved without baptism, but it cannot from thence be concluded that *none* beside those will be admitted without this condition.

But, to cut off all manner of subterfuges, let us consider a little who are the subjects of whom Christ speaks, for this will be the only way to fix our Lord's meaning. He says, *Except any one, &c.* Any one what? If our Lord speaks of beings in general, then it means any one being; if he speaks of angels, he means any one angel; if he speaks of mankind, as our adversaries take it, then indeed he means any one of that species: but if he speaks of men only, he intends any one man; if he speaks of women only, any one woman; if of children only, any one child, &c.; and if our Lord speaks only of adult persons, who have heard the word of God preached, then *τις* in the text can mean only *any one such adult hearer*. And so our Saviour's meaning might be expressed thus: '*Except any one who is come to the use of his reason, and has heard the word of God preached, be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*' And this we assert is the only genuine meaning of our Lord's words; which we also think appears evidently from these following considerations:

1. Because such only can be expected to comply with the institution, which indeed cannot oblige any others, for all laws oblige

those only to whom they are given, and cannot be said to be given to those who cannot possibly know them, which is a direct contradiction; for to give a law, is to make it known to those for whom it is designed; and therefore, while they cannot know it, the law is not given to them, nor can they be obliged by it. Hence Gratian, 'Laws are made when they are promulgated<sup>f</sup>.' And thus St. Paul argues expressly, that *those that have sinned without law shall perish without law, but as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law*, Rom. ii. 12. And again, *We know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law*, ch. iii. 19, intimating, that the law obliged the Jews only to whom it was known, but not those Gentiles who were invincibly ignorant of it. And again, ch. iv. 15, he assures us that every thing is indifferent, till prohibited or enjoined by some law; and therefore, *where no law is, there is no transgression*. Now as this was argued to the Jews, to whom the law was made known, from which the Gentiles were excused, because they could not come at the knowledge of it; so in relation to the law of Christ, they, whether infants or adult persons, who cannot come to the knowledge of it, are not obliged to keep it, neither shall they be judged by it: for the great Legislator himself has said it, *If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin*, John xvi. 22; but to these Christ never yet came nor spoke. As before Christ appeared, none were bound to believe and live according to his peculiar doctrines; so now they who are ignorant, are not obliged to do so till he is made known to them. For the reason is the same now, with those who cannot believe in him because they have not heard, as with those who could not then, because he was not come, and in equity they are full as excusable. For as St. Paul says, Rom. x. 14, *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?*

2. As only they who have heard, and are capable of understanding, can ever be willing to submit themselves to this ordinance of baptism, so neither can any others be saved by it; for St. Peter, purposely to obviate this mistake of supposing the bare external washing would suffice, tells us, the whole efficacy of baptism lies in this, that it is done in obedience to our Lord's will, and as engaging ourselves to continue in that obedience: and so indeed baptism will undoubtedly *save us*, not as it is *the putting away the filth of the flesh*, but as it is *the answer of a good conscience toward God*. But since the saving efficacy does not consist in the external washing; infants, who are capable only of that, cannot be saved by baptism,

<sup>f</sup> Leges instituuntur cum promulgantur.

nor reap any benefit by it: and we cannot suppose that Christ's words are contrary to these, which yet they must be, if he meant that no children could enter into the kingdom of heaven unless they were baptized; for then it may be said of them, contrary to St. Peter, that the external washing does save them. The bishop of Salisbury speaks well to this passage, in his Exposition of the Articles, page 303.

These words of St. Peter are an impregnable fortress of anti-pædobaptism, and all the attempts of our adversaries against them hitherto have been unsuccessful, and will probably ever be so. Dr. Hammond<sup>s</sup> trifles upon them most egregiously, and supposes all grown persons should receive baptism with a good conscience, but infants may receive it without any conscience at all, notwithstanding this text makes conscience so necessary to the saving virtue of it.

Dr. Whitby, though directly opposing our argument from the words, did not think Dr. Hammond's pretences worth mentioning; but only observes, that St. Paul says as much of circumcision as St. Peter does here of baptism, viz. that *the true circumcision before God is not the outward circumcision of the flesh, but the internal circumcision of the heart and spirit*, Rom. ii. 29. 'But will any one hence 'argue,' says the doctor, 'that the Jewish infants for want of this 'were not to be admitted into covenant with God by circumcision? 'And yet the argument is plainly parallel.' But with submission to the doctor, I am of opinion the cases are not at all parallel. For the baptism which saves is expressly described and limited to be, 1. *Not the putting away the filth of the flesh*: but, 2. *The answer of a good conscience*. Whereas St. Paul's words do not import that the only circumcision which saved was, 1. *Not the circumcision of the flesh*: but, 2. *The circumcision of the heart and spirit*. Or however, there is certainly this difference, that St. Paul does not speak of circumcision while it continued in force, as under the dispensation of Moses; but only says that now, under this new dispensation of Jesus Christ, the only available circumcision is that of the heart: and it will be allowed that the outward circumcision is now of no use at all; for in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love, Gal. v. 6, and vi. 15. St. Paul therefore is arguing against the necessity of external circumcision, and beating down the partition-wall of a Jewish rite; which cannot be said of St. Peter in relation to baptism. But if the arguings of the two apostles are supposed to be parallel, then



St. Peter must be understood to mean, that persons need not be baptized with the outward baptism, if they do but keep the righteousness of the Gospel; and to plead for the uselessness of baptism, as St. Paul does of circumcision: whereas St. Paul does not deny but external circumcision might in some cases be sufficient under the old law, and therefore infants were then capable of that ceremony; though now, under the Gospel which requires circumcision of the heart, they are altogether unfit to be admitted to baptism, because altogether incapable of that internal circumcision, or of making that *answer of a good conscience*.

3. Another thing from whence it may appear infants are not intended, is, that this manner of speech is usual in Scripture, even when it is certain the things said cannot be required of infants, nor indeed of any but those who have heard the word preached. Thus John vi. 53, with the same solemnity of asseveration our Lord says, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*. If we understand this of the sacramental supper, and take it as extensively as our adversaries do John iii. 5, then it absolutely denies that any who have never received the communion, whether infants or others, can be saved, or have eternal life, that is, *enter into the kingdom of glory*: or if we expound the words metaphorically, to signify believing in the Son of man, (which, I think, none can doubt to be the sense of them, after what Dr. Whitby has said with his usual solidity,) it is still as certain, by an interpretation of this latitude, that none who do not actually believe can be saved. For as in one passage Christ makes it an indispensable condition of entering into the kingdom, to be *born again*; so here he makes it altogether as indispensable to *eat his flesh*, that is, to believe; and both in the same latitude. But since all will see it reasonable and necessary to except infants in one case, it is as reasonable to do so in the other.

The same may be argued from those other words of our Saviour after his resurrection, Mark xvi. 16, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned*. If these words must be extended to all, and applied to every one, then no one person, no not any infant, can be saved without faith. And this would make the Scriptures contradictory; for according to the arguing of our antagonists, it is declared here that no infant, even though baptized, can ever be saved, because it is impossible for him to understand and believe; which is directly opposite to their sense of John iii. 5. If it can be fancied that, if infants are but baptized

here, it will be enough, because they may have more complete capacities in the next life, and then they will believe; I will only answer, that the same may equally be said of all mankind, for all will at the resurrection believe and own that Jesus is the Christ, and undoubtedly they will be very sorry for their former infidelity and disobedience; but this belief shall then have no other effect than it has now on the devils, to make them tremble: for the faith that is saving must take place while we are here, and work by love.

You must needs have observed many passages of this nature; and it would be endless to mention all. There are two, I remember, in the very same chapter with the words under consideration, which being so near may serve to shew us the bent of our Lord's discourse at that time, and to whom it referred; for he, who could speak no contradictions, says, verse 18, *He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God.* The words, verse 5, cannot be thought more extensive than these, and both refer to the same subjects: but if in one place he means that infants may be saved by baptism, and yet presently after asserts none can be saved without believing in him, though they are baptized; how can this be made consistent? for this second condition is what infants are incapable of. He must therefore be understood in both places to speak of persons capable both of believing and being baptized.

In fine; if we understand this in such like places with due regard to God's justice and equity, we shall truly say, they relate only to adult persons who have heard the Gospel preached; for such, unless they believe and are baptized, cannot be saved. And therefore I must confess I think those persons are greatly to blame, who either oppose and abolish the use of baptism, or change it for what is not baptism: but God, who is merciful, knows their hearts. And we have great reason to hope, others shall be saved without either faith or baptism. Those who did not know their Master's will when they might have known it, were to be beaten with few stripes; those then who could not know it shall doubtless receive no stripes at all, because they are, in that respect, guilty of no fault: and none of the damned shall have that excuse, to plead they could not possibly escape, and are damned of necessity, merely for want of knowledge, which they had not the means to attain: for this would be a most unworthy reflection on the best and kindest of beings.

4. Another thing which shews infants are not referred to in John iii. 5, is, that what is there said cannot be true of them. For

as we are sure the holy angels, though not baptized with water, shall enter into the kingdom; and therefore we say the words do not relate to them: so we may reasonably suppose all infants shall, whether baptized or not, enter into the kingdom of glory; and therefore the words under consideration cannot relate to them neither. If there be any mercy in God, in him who is goodness itself, which the greatest impiety dares not doubt of; then all infants, who could never offend him, shall assuredly be saved. But if this be true, the sense our adversaries give of the words under consideration cannot be true; for then millions of infants shall not be saved. The only way to avoid so uncharitable an inference will be, to say the words do not concern infant-baptism at all. God our Saviour cannot ordain such unreasonable laws, nor infinite mercy make the happiness of any of his creatures to depend upon conditions that were impossible for them to perform. And Christ himself, our great Lawgiver and Oracle, has declared of infants in particular, that *of such is the kingdom of heaven*, Mark x. 14, even of unbaptized infants, for such were those he spoke of.

5. In the last place: there is something in the words themselves which does expressly limit them only to adult persons; for they require, that the subjects spoken of should be *born of the Spirit*, as well as of *water*. Which, not to enter into a long discourse upon it, certainly means, as the bishop of Salisbury has expressed it, 'except he were inwardly changed by a secret power called the *Spirit*, that should transform his nature, he could not enter into the *kingdom of heaven*<sup>b</sup>.' For this sense is drawn from plain passages of Scripture. Our Lord himself, even in the next verse, explains it, *He that is born of the flesh is flesh*; that is, lives after the motions of the flesh: *but he that is born of the Spirit is spirit*; that is, strives to live according to the motions of the Spirit. So those who received Christ, and believed on his name, are said to be *born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God*, John i. 13. And again, *Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin*; and it is from that very principle that *he cannot sin because he is born of God*, 1 John iii. 9. And St. Paul expounds this matter somewhat largely, Rom. viii, where he sufficiently shews, that to be *born of the flesh*, is to be so subject to it as to mind the things of the flesh; and to be *born of the Spirit*, is to be filled with such holy principles and inclinations as to mind the things of the Spirit.

If then to be *born of the Spirit* signifies to be so influenced and wrought upon as to mind the things of the Spirit, or live after

<sup>b</sup> Article xxvii. p. 301.

the motions of the Spirit, as all judicious divines and critics, Scaliger, Grotius, Le Clerc, &c., and even Dr. Hammond too, will allow; and infants cannot possibly be so born of the Spirit: then that text, which requires the subjects it speaks of should be *born of the Spirit* cannot speak of infants.

To evade this, Mr. Wall insinuates, that because it is and must be allowed that the Holy Spirit, 'besides his office of converting the heart, does seal and apply pardon of sin, and other promises of the covenant;' this is to be taken for all that is meant in the text by *born of the Spirit*. But as this is not confirmed by any text of Scripture, I leave you to judge whether it answers the force of the phrase: and I will conclude what I have said on this text with Dr. Whitby's judicious observations upon it.

1. 'Infants must be excepted from this necessity, as being incapable of knowing, and therefore of transgressing this command,' &c.

2. 'They also are to be excepted who want that baptism they desire, not out of contempt, but of necessity, as dying before they can procure it: thus though the infant, who died before the eighth day, died without the sign of the covenant, the Jews never thought fit to circumcise them before that day; and since it is not the washing of the body, but the stipulation of a *good conscience*, that renders baptism saving, 1 Pet. iii. 21, it cannot be purely the want, but the contempt of that, which must condemn us.' And,

3. 'Whatever ignorance of the precept, or mistake about the nature of it, renders not men incapable of baptism by the Holy Ghost, can never render them incapable of the salvation promised to the baptized.'

The next observation our author makes from St. Hermas' words is grounded particularly on this, that St. Hermas represents the patriarchs and holy men before Christ as having need to be baptized, and actually being so in the life they are now in; for his words are these: 'It was necessary for them to come up by water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God, than by putting off the mortality of their former life; they therefore, after they were dead, were sealed with the seal of the Son of God,' &c. From whence Mr. Wall infers, that if baptism was in St. Hermas' opinion so necessary to the salvation of these just men, as that they could not be saved without it, and therefore were baptized after their death in that separate state; then he must needs have thought it as necessary for all other persons,

<sup>i</sup> [See Whitby's Annotations on John iii. 5.]



and infants among the rest : and therefore the church of that time practised the baptism of infants.

But what wild sort of logic is this ! for there is no manner of connexion between the propositions. Suppose St. Hermas did think those persons were baptized in their separate state ; it does not therefore follow, that he thought infants must be baptized in this : nor, if he did think so, that the church of that time practised pædobaptism ; for St. Hermas gives not the least hint of that : and yet Mr. Wall pretends only to cite the Fathers in this dispute, as they relate, not to their own private opinions, but to the practice of the whole church. So that his way of arguing here has no tendency to the proposition he ought to prove ; which, to say the best of it, is grounded on obscure uncertain parables, and very distant licentious inferences from them.

But to answer more distinctly.

1. St. Hermas is only describing a vision, to represent the building up of the church ; and therefore every particular cannot be fairly understood in the letter ; according to the known rule, ‘ Similitudes ‘ do not run on all four.’ Thus our Saviour’s parable of the ten virgins with their lamps is not to be understood, that ten virgins, five wise and five foolish, shall go forth to meet him at his second coming ; the first five being well provided with oil, and having their lamps trimmed at the alarm : and the others being surprised, with their lamps unlighted and having no oil, and that they shall attempt to buy some, or the like. And though our Lord is pleased to represent his care and patience towards us under the notion of the dresser of a vineyard, Luke xiii. 6, &c., no man can imagine he will literally dress and prune us, but only that he does in us what is equivalent to dressing and pruning to a vine.

Now these not being true histories, but only figurative representations of something, I wonder Mr. Wall should use them otherwise. He knows the books he argues from are nothing but visions ; and therefore, though it be ever so express that the patriarchs were baptized, it is no more to be understood in the letter, than the other things I have mentioned : they were baptized, that is, in vision only, not in deed. Or, if our author’s way of arguing be just, it equally follows, that in the other world we must all be transformed into stones, and compose a lofty pile of building. But as this inference will not be allowed, so neither ought the other.

2. Besides, St. Hermas cannot be thought to mean those just persons were really baptized with material water ; because, in the separate state they are in, their bodies being consumed, and that of

them which remains alive being only spirit, they are utterly incapable of real baptism: for it is altogether inconceivable that spirits can be immersed in water. And as stones were not the persons, but only represented them; so their baptism was only a representation of something else. The passage therefore can do our author no manner of service; for it is only of material baptism we are disputing, not a visionary, nor a mystical one.

3. Though St. Hermas should be allowed to plead for the necessity of baptism to those just men, yet this has no relation to infant-baptism; nor does St. Hermas give any ground to imagine he had infants in his thoughts; he speaks only of adult persons, who had committed actual sins, from which he might suppose they needed to be washed. But it is no consequence, that it must be as necessary to others that are not adult; no more than because it is useful to men, it must therefore be so to angels. Nay, on the contrary, he seems very plainly to exclude infants from being capable of receiving any benefit by baptism: for in this very passage he intimates they were to be baptized for something done in their former life, which he calls ‘the mortality of their former life;’ and he cannot be understood to mean any thing but the offences they had committed in that life. Infants therefore having no such mortality of a former life to account for, were not represented by St. Hermas to have been baptized: and since he makes baptism necessary to the patriarchs, &c. only on that account, it cannot possibly be applied to the case of infants.

It may be added also, that St. Hermas here makes it equally necessary to ‘take up the name of the Son of God<sup>k</sup>.’ And he likewise asserts, that ‘it will avail nothing to take up the name of the ‘Son of God, unless thou shalt also receive their (viz. the virgins’) ‘garments from them<sup>l</sup>.’ Now the names of these virgins, he says, are ‘faith, abstinence, power, patience, &c.; whoever bears these ‘names, and the name of the Son of God, shall enter into the kingdom<sup>m</sup>.’ I suppose the least Mr. Wall understands by ‘taking the ‘name of the Son of God’ is, to be baptized; and then it is plain, St. Hermas declares baptism without *faith, abstinence, &c.*, will avail nothing, or is of no use at all: from whence it is manifest, not only that this passage cannot be improved for infant-baptism; but also, that it yields a good argument against it: for if baptism signify

<sup>k</sup> Lib. iii. Simil. 9. cap. 12.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. cap. 13.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. cap. 15. Quicumque itaque

portant hæc nomina, et nomen Filii Dei, in regnum Dei poterunt intrare.

nothing without those virtues, then to be sure St. Hermas did not think it of any use to infants, who have them not.

4. But in the last place, if St. Hermas should be thought to make baptism necessary to the salvation of infants; yet since he finds an expedient for the patriarchs, &c., who lived before Christ, to be baptized in their separate state, why may not we suppose he thought infants ought not to be baptized till they come into that separate state too? The patriarchs were supposed to receive baptism there, because they could not know and believe in Jesus here; and the same reason holds exactly as to infants. So that, after all, if our author's citation proves any thing in favour of infant-baptism, it is only that they shall be baptized in the other world: but be this as it will, it is sufficient that they are not to be baptized here, which is all we insist on.

Mr. Wall cites another passage from St. Hermas<sup>n</sup>, which I had some time since noted as an instance against paedobaptism. It is strange that the same words should be cited to such contrary purposes. They are thus translated; 'All infants are valued by the Lord, and esteemed the first of all.' It is very dubious what infants are here meant, whether infants in age, or infants in Christianity; and what renders it so doubtful is a sentence at the beginning of this chapter: 'such as have believed like sincere children' (it is *infantes* in the Latin). And since he here speaks of such infants as believed, he may perhaps afterwards too mean only such. Dr. Wake seems to have understood the passage so, by his supplying the word *such*; and the words our author cites refer to *such* infants as were spoken of before.

But if they should refer to infants in age, as perhaps they may; yet even then I do not see how they can be strained to signify that infants ought to be baptized. For here is no mention of baptism at all: and therefore, unless our author can demonstrate for a general principle, that all persons whom God esteems ought to be baptized, it will be very difficult for any one to imagine how baptism can be deduced from hence. No man can see any necessary connection between God's love and baptism; and the Scriptures nowhere furnish Mr. Wall with this piece of divinity. The holy angels are certainly highly esteemed and favoured by him; but nobody pretends they ought therefore to be baptized. In like manner, Almighty God may have a great esteem for infants, and love them according to his infinite mercy and compassion, without requiring

<sup>n</sup> Part i. p. 6. [33.]

of them the ceremony of being baptized. At least, since St. Hermas nowhere confirms this supposition, that all whom God esteems ought to be baptized; it must pass only for our author's own conjecture, which renders the argument from this place invalid; for since both the premises are not St. Hermas', it is plain the conclusion is not his.

On the contrary, it is very natural to conclude from the words, that this Father neither held the necessity of infant-baptism, nor practised it; for he says 'All infants,' without exception, as if they were all upon the same level, and therefore, baptized or unbaptized, it matters not; 'All are valued by the Lord, and esteemed the 'first of all,' merely as they are infants, and therefore, 'innocent.' And nowhere throughout his writings has he left the least intimation that he ever once thought of the baptizing them. If he had known any thing of incorporating children into the church, it is strange in his representations of the several materials of which the church was built, that he should never give infants one place, but constantly neglect them; especially considering how exceeding nice and particular he is, and that he frequently had the fittest occasions in the world to introduce them. But besides this total silence in such cases, which is very considerable, this Father has several expressions which are as inconsistent with the notion of infant-baptism, as any thing can be. For instance, to mention but one, chap. xxxi. he says, 'And I say unto you all, whoever have received 'this seal, keep simplicity, and remember not affronts,' &c. Now this instruction is given with the utmost latitude, doubly enforced both by an universal collective *all*, and then an universal distributive *whoever*; than which nothing can be more extensive. But the things mentioned there not falling within the power and cognizance of infants, it follows they cannot be intended, and that St. Hermas did not think them to be of their number who had, or ought to have, received the seal. It is not possible any inference should be more direct and necessary.

But to return back to Mr. Wall's management of the other citation. He supposes, 1. Christ's words, Matth. xix. 14, *Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven*, are a plain argument for infant-baptism. And, 2. that the words of St. Hermas are of the same import.

As to the words of our Lord, which Mr. Wall (with many other

o Lib. iii. cap. 31. [Simil. ix.]

habete, neque offensarum memores estote, &c.

p Dico autem omnibus vobis, quicumque sigillum hoc accepistis, simplicitatem



pædobaptists) so much perverts, if any thing is plain concerning them, it is, that they have no relation to baptism at all, nor to any thing necessarily connected with it. You know the story in the Gospel, and the circumstances of it; but what is there, I beseech you, in the whole matter, which can make our adversaries fasten on this place? It can only be the mention of children; and they might as well have cited all the passages in Scripture where children are named.

But Mr. Wall does not reason from the words in Matt. xix. 14, but only cites them, as if they were very plain to his purpose; and therefore we are to seek in other authors for the argument. Dr. Hammond<sup>q</sup> himself reckons this among the more imperfect ways of proving the point, and therefore our author should not so easily have taken it for granted. But Dr. Whitby is pleased to improve the passage to the utmost advantage; and he being in general so very fair and sincere a writer, and comprehending the whole substance of what can be urged from the place, I will examine what he has said.

His first and second observations; namely, That they were infants in age who were brought to Christ; and that they were brought by such as believed Christ to be a prophet sent from God;—may be allowed: but the third thing, viz. That they were not brought to be healed of any diseases, cannot be easily granted: for though it is not expressly said they were, yet, since it was the Lord's custom frequently to heal by laying on his hands, it is probable enough this was the design of those who brought them to him, though it is only said they brought them to have his hands laid on them. The imposition of his hands could not well be the ultimate end, but only the intermediate, in order to something else; which might be *healing*, for what appears, but cannot be supposed to be their being baptized. Or if Christ did not lay his hands on them to heal them, it was perhaps, as Origen puts it, 'They believed that  
' no evil spirit could enter, nor any other misfortune befall those  
' infants or children whom Christ had once touched, by reason of  
' some virtue that was thereby communicated to them. And since  
' the evil powers are continually lying in wait to corrupt men's  
' minds from the beginning; I am of opinion, that they who  
' brought the children to Christ, seeing his mighty power, brought  
' them to him, that by laying his hands on them, &c., by means of  
' the touch (*διὰ τῆς ἀφῆς*) every evil might be expelled,' &c.

There is therefore no necessity to suppose so readily, that they

<sup>q</sup> Six Queries, p. 105.

<sup>r</sup> In Matth. p. 373 B.

were brought to receive spiritual blessings; for, what spiritual blessings could they receive? Not remission of sins, says the doctor; for the Jews did not think them guilty of any; and we never find hands were laid on any for that purpose. But it was, says he, 'to obtain for them some spiritual blessing appertaining to the kingdom of God.' What spiritual blessing this could be, or on what grounds it is asserted, I see not; and the doctor gives no reason for it. But he puts another supposition borrowed from Dr. Lightfoot, that Christ laid his hands on them, 'to own them as belonging to his kingdom.' But this could not be the meaning of it, both because we nowhere find this ceremony used for this purpose; and he had just before declared, *of such is the kingdom of heaven*, before *he took them in his arms, and laid his hands on them*. The laying on of his hands therefore must be for some other end.

Besides, if they were capable of spiritual blessings, as undoubtedly they are of being saved by Christ, what is all this to infant-baptism? Will it follow, that because they may be happy hereafter, they must be baptized here? Many infants shall, and all may, be saved without being baptized. And there is a great deal to this purpose comprehended in our Saviour's saying, *of such*, speaking even of unbaptized infants, *is the kingdom of heaven*.

The fourth observation the doctor is pleased to make is particularly on these words, *for of such is the kingdom of heaven*: from whence he thinks it may reasonably be collected, 'that there is something in little children why they should not be hindered from coming to him, besides their being emblems of humility;' and this he supposes can be nothing 'but the fitness of them to be early dedicated to the service of God, and to enter into covenant with him by the rites appointed by him for that end.' But though it will be readily allowed that infants are capable of receiving the kingdom, it can in no wise follow, that this means nothing else but their fitness to enter into covenant. This is directly begging the question. If by *kingdom of heaven* were meant the church of Christ, there might indeed be some greater colour for the doctor's way of arguing: but if it means only the *kingdom of glory*, as it plainly does, then the doctor's argument is grounded on a mistake; for though infants are subjects of the kingdom of glory, it will not on that account appear necessary for them to be baptized, in order to qualify them for that glory: on the contrary, it rather follows, since as infants they are subjects of that kingdom, they have no need of this ceremony to give them a right which they have already.

The right reverend bishop of Salisbury says, that ‘whatever these words may signify mystically, the literal meaning of them is, that little children may be admitted into the dispensation of the Messiah; and by consequence, that they may be baptized.’ Thus his lordship seems to make it a plain case; but I cannot perceive how the words have any relation to children’s being received into that dispensation at all. *The kingdom of heaven* can in no wise mean so here, though it be true, as his lordship says, this is the sense of the words almost universally through the whole Gospel: for St. Mark has preserved some of our Lord’s words on that occasion, which make it necessary to understand thereby the *kingdom of glory*: thus chap. x. 15, our Lord says, *Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein*; that is, into glory; for into the church the greatest villains may be admitted, if they conceal their wickedness; so that he must mean, they shall not enter into his glorious kingdom. Besides, if the kingdom did mean the church, how does it appear infants were to be admitted into it by baptism? Baptism is the only way of admitting adult persons, but is nowhere prescribed to infants. I should rather imagine from the words, that if infants are to be admitted at all by any ceremony, it must be only by laying on of hands, and by prayer; for neither our Lord’s words nor his actions give us room to think of any other.

And if this way of arguing be good, it may equally be urged that infants ought to be communicated too; for if, because *of such is the kingdom of heaven*, they may therefore be admitted into the dispensation of the Messiah, and consequently have a right to the privileges and sacraments of it, they must have a right to the supper as well as to baptism. But his lordship, and our adversaries, do refuse them one; and we beg leave to refuse them the other for the very same reasons, viz. because they are not capable of it, nor of the conditions which the church of England itself confesses are required of persons to be baptized, viz. *faith and repentance*.

Since then there is nothing in Christ’s words for the practice of the pædobaptists; the passage of St. Hermas, which our author compares with these words of Christ, cannot be thought to prove, by any supposed affinity between them, that St. Hermas, or the church of that time, knew any thing of infant-baptism. Besides, I have not only shewn the arguments from the writings of the Fathers hitherto have no reference to it; but also, as far as things of this nature can be shewn, that all of them to this time, namely,

for about a hundred years after Christ's birth, believed nothing at all of it, for what they say is very inconsistent with that practice. In my next, I will also examine what is said from St. Justin and others, in the order in which Mr. Wall has placed them.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

## LETTER XII.

WHAT Mr. Wall produces from the writings of the second century examined—

A passage in St. Justin considered—It makes nothing for infant-baptism—Neither does it speak of original sin, as our author pretends—Mr. Wall has perverted the words—His translation of them unintelligible—'Ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ means from Adam—Another misconstruction noted—The phrase explained by a passage in Dionysius Halicarnassæus; and another in Thucydides—Another passage from St. Justin considered—He does not call baptism *circumcision*—He could not mean baptism by the spiritual circumcision he speaks of—What he understands by spiritual circumcision—Other writers of the primitive church talk in the same manner—Coloss. ii. 11, 12. considered—The Scripture nowhere calls baptism *circumcision*—The words in themselves are not capable of the sense our adversaries give them—The ancients did not call baptism the circumcision without hands, as Mr. Wall pretends—Mr. Wall's argument from the parallel between circumcision and baptism, shewn to be groundless—The principle on which it is founded, evidently false—Some of the consequences of it: as that baptism must be administered only on the eighth day; that females must not be baptized—As the apostles did not make circumcision their rule in relation to baptism, so neither should we—Another passage from St. Justin—It is not to be imagined he should forbear to mention infant-baptism, if it had been then practised—Or however, he ought not to have spoken so as is inconsistent with that practice—The passage is directly against infant-baptism—The reason why Mr. Wall cites this passage, though he confesses it makes nothing for infant-baptism—The first reason makes against him—His next reason, that regeneration is put for baptism, groundless—St. Justin never understands regeneration so—Baptism not regeneration, but the symbol of it—The third reason contradicts his former assertion—Another passage from St. Justin—Which Mr. Wall draws to his side by a very unfair translation—'Ἐκ παιδῶν signifies from their childhood—Illustrated by instances from Cicero; from Laertius; from Plato; from Plutarch; from Origen; from Theophilus Antiochenus; from the Scriptures—Mr. Wall himself translates a passage of St. Basil thus on another occasion—The famous passage from St. Irenæus considered—It is not genuine—Cardinal Baronius observes, the latter part of the chapter contradicts the beginning—Petavius' answer to this proves nothing—The author of the last part of the chapter attempts to confirm a manifest falsehood, by the authority of the ancients from St. John, which St. Irenæus could never have done—Mr. Dodwell's pretence, that St. John, &c., judged of our Lord's age by his countenance, too weak and groundless—They could not but know the time



of our Lord's birth more exactly—St. Irenæus could not think Christ arrived to near so much as his fortieth year : the contrary being so evident from the censual rolls then in being, and from the disputes with the adversaries of the Christian religion—Nay, it appears from St. Irenæus' own words, that he was not in so gross an error—He fixes the time of the Lord's birth—The time of his passion computed; from the destruction of Jerusalem; from the time of Pontius Pilate's government, and Tiberius' reign—Mr. Dodwell's attempt to excuse the extravagance of this spurious passage, wholly useless—Besides, the passage is taken only from a very bad translation; as learned men confess : viz. Scaliger; Du Pin; Mr. Dodwell; Dr. Grabe—This may also appear by comparing it with the remaining fragments of the original—Again, the word *regenerated* in this passage does not mean baptized—The Jews did not give rise to this way of speaking—The Scripture notion of regeneration—John iii. 5. considered—The regeneration there mentioned consists in the operations of the Spirit, of which baptism is the sign and seal—And this appears from our Lord's own words following—Titus iii. 5. considered—That the ancients never mean baptism, but an internal change, by regeneration, shewn from Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Clemens Romanus, St. Barnabas; and St. Irenæus nowhere uses the word, as our author pretends he always does—The inference from these observations—A contradiction of Mr. Wall's—Another exception to the passage cited from St. Irenæus is, that *infantes* does not necessarily mean such young children as the pædobaptists admit to baptism—*Omnis ætas* does not always include infants, as appears by an instance from St. Cyprian; Recognitions; Dionysius of Alexandria—Nor does the enumeration of the several ages make it necessary to understand such infants as are not capable of reason—Infancy, according to St. Irenæus himself, reaches to ten years of age; as Mr. Dodwell also thinks—The inference—Persons under ten capable of instruction and baptism—Recapitulation and conclusion.

---

SIR,

THE first century of Christianity I have already despatched, and am now to examine the second.

Mr. Wall begins with St. Justin the Martyr, who lived about anno Christi 140; but the pieces he cites of this Father were all writ after 150, so that he passes over half the second century without any attempt upon it, and therefore I conclude that at least for one hundred and fifty years after Christ infant-baptism was not known in the world, or however, that our adversaries are not able to prove it was.

The first passage our author cites is out of the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, which he says is 'only to shew, that in these  
' times so very near the apostles, they spake of original sin affecting  
' all mankind descended of Adam; and understood that besides the  
' actual sins of each particular person, there is in our nature itself,  
' since the fall, something that needs redemption and forgiveness by

‘the merits of Christa.’ But this does not concern the baptizing of infants, and therefore Mr. Wall adds of his own, ‘And that is ‘ordinarily [to be] applied to every particular person by baptism;’ which signifies nothing, unless he can shew it is St. Justin’s assertion. He is to prove, that St. Justin and the church in his time thought so, and not to suppose they did; nor is it sufficient to say the Scripture teaches it, for the question here immediately is, not what the Scriptures teach, but what St. Justin teaches; though by the way the Scripture no more teaches that our Saviour’s merits are to be applied to any persons by baptism, than it does that his merits must be applied by faith or by the supper in which the cup is the *new covenant in his blood*. St. Justin’s expressions therefore are of no force, unless he had gone upon our author’s principle, which he does not appear to have done.

All that can be urged from his mentioning original sin, I have fully answered before<sup>b</sup>. Besides, it is much to be questioned, whether St. Justin, and most of the ancients of the first centuries, believed the notion. Mr. Wall has very much perverted the words of this passage, to make them speak to his purpose, and given such a translation of them as no schoolboy would have made. Whether he did it out of ignorance or inadvertency, I shall not determine.

The place, I think, should be rendered thus: ‘As also, neither did he submit to be born and crucified, as being under any ‘necessity to do it; but he did this for mankind, which from (not *by*) Adam was fallen under death and the guile of the serpent, by ‘their own act and deed, every one having done wickedly<sup>c</sup>.’ This makes the passage rather opposite to the doctrine of original sin, than in favour of it. Mr. Wall’s translation is hardly intelligible; ‘But he did this for mankind, which by Adam was fallen under ‘death, and the guile of the serpent, beside the particular cause ‘which each man had of sinning.’

But you see, as I have rendered it, the sense is very natural and easy. And that St. Justin meant as I understand him, appears from the words immediately following those already transcribed; ‘For ‘God willing that all angels and men should be free agents, and ‘that their actions should be determined by their own free choice ‘——that if they did what was pleasing to him, they might be ‘kept incorruptible and free from punishment; but if they did

<sup>a</sup> Part i. p. 13. [40.]

<sup>b</sup> Page 257, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. pp. 315, 316.  
 “Ὡςπερ οὐδὲ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, ὡς ἐνδεῆς τούτων, ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ’

ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὕφους ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένοι. [Sect. 88. edit. Benedict.]

‘ wickedly, he might punish every one according to his pleasure<sup>d</sup>.’ Now to say here, that every man was designed by God to stand upon his own bottom, and to connect this by the illative particle *for* to another sentence wherein he says all fell in Adam, is so great an absurdity, that we cannot, with any good manners, suppose St. Justin to be guilty of it: for nothing can be more contradictory than to say all are sinners, in or by Adam, and yet that none are sinners but by their own free choice and action.

Besides, it is necessary to understand St. Justin as I have done, even from the propriety of the phrase he makes use of. That ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ means *from Adam*, and not, as our author renders it, *by Adam*, might be proved from an infinite number of instances; but I need only mention Rom. v. 14, where we find exactly the same phrase, in the very same sense too, which makes it not improbable that St. Justin had his eye upon this very place, and alludes to it, *Death reigned from Adam*, that is, in St. Justin’s words, ‘ Mankind from Adam was fallen under death,’ &c. But the sense Mr. Wall would put upon ἀπὸ is several times in this chapter expressed by διὰ; thus ver. 9, *We shall be saved from wrath through him* (δι’ αὐτοῦ), and ver. 10, *We were reconciled to God by* (διὰ) *the death of his Son*, and ver. 11, (δι’ οὗ) *By whom we have now received the atonement*; and in the next verse it is said not ἀπὸ, but δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου, *By one man sin entered into the world*, &c., by which it is evident, that ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ and διὰ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ mean different things.

As to the other misconstruction of St. Justin’s words, which I think Mr. Wall has made, it is not only very considerable, in that it makes St. Justin speak inconsistently, and so as not to be understood, but it is plain also to all who have any tolerable skill in the Greek, that παρὰ, which Mr. Wall here renders *beside*, ought to be rendered *for*, *by*, *because of*, &c. Thus that common phrase, παρ’ ὃ, signifies *for which reason*, or the like; so Dionysius Halicarnassæus says<sup>e</sup>, παρ’ ὃ, ‘ for which reason also the things mentioned ‘ in the epilogue are called *exclamations*.’ In his Roman Antiquities, he has the very phrase of St. Justin; and the occasion will convince you that it must be understood as I have translated it. Sicius Dentatus, an experienced commander, accompanied Romilius the consul, with a band of eight hundred veterans, against the Æqui.

<sup>d</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 316 A. Βουλόμενος γὰρ τοὺτους ἐν ἐλευθέρᾳ προαιρέσει, καὶ αὐτεξουσίους γενομένους, τοὺς τε ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὁ Θεὸς πράττειν ὅσα ἕκαστον ἐνεδυνάμωσε δύνασθαι ποιεῖν, ἐποίησεν· εἰ μὲν τὰ εὐάρεστα αὐτῷ αἰροῦντο,

καὶ ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀτιμωρήτους αὐτοὺς τηρῆσαι· εἰ δὲ πονηρεύσωνται, ὡς αὐτῷ δοκεῖ ἕκαστον κολάζειν. [ibid.]

<sup>e</sup> Ars Rhetoric. cap. x. § 18. Παρ’ ὃ καὶ ἐπιφωνήματα καλοῦσι τὰ ἐν ἐπιλόγοις λεγόμενα.



In this expedition, Romilius, in order to sacrifice this great man to his ambition and envy, sends him with his veterans to attack the enemy, under such disadvantages as they must necessarily have been all cut to pieces. Siccus undertakes the attempt, but leads his men, unknown to the general, another way, and so falling upon the enemy unexpectedly, while the two armies were engaged, gave them a total overthrow. Siccus at his return to Rome relates the whole story to the tribune and people, with the consul's design upon them, 'and that it was by his own valour and conduct (*παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρετὴν*, says Dionysius) and of those who were with him, 'whom the consul had designed for destruction, that the enemy's 'camp was taken,' &c. It is plain here, from the circumstances of the story, that *παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν* means *by their own*, in opposition to another's; and so too it should in St. Justin signify *by their own fault*, in opposition to another's. There is another instance to the same purpose in Thucydides, where the sense is much the same as in St. Justin, though the expression is something varied. Pericles is setting forth the inconveniences of the divided state, and consequently the weakness of the Peloponnesians: 'Some indeed,' says he, 'are for prosecuting their revenge with the utmost application, but others are 'fearful lest they prejudice their own particular affairs: and when, 'after a thousand delays, they are at last got together, they can 'bestow but a very little time on the common good; for they 'have none to spare from their own particular concerns. And every 'one fancies the public will suffer nothing by his neglect (*παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀμέλειαν*).' This is exactly as St. Justin says, all men are 'fallen under death *παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν*, 'by their own particular 'fault.'

The next passage of St. Justin which our author uses is in the same dialogue, where he meets with some expressions, from whence he ventures to infer, though very unfairly, that St. Justin thought baptism was to Christians instead of circumcision, and therefore like that ought to be administered to infants. The holy martyr, arguing against the ceremonies of the law, takes occasion to oppose to the carnal circumcision that which is spiritual: 'And this we, being 'sinners, through God's mercy have received,' says he, 'by baptism; 'and every one is permitted to receive it in the same way.' But if

<sup>f</sup> Dionys. Halicarnass. Antiq. Rom. lib. x. p. 641. Καὶ ὅτι παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρετὴν καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέρων ὀκτακοσίων ἀνδρῶν, οὓς ἀποθανομένους ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἥπατοι ὅ τε χάραξ ὁ τῶν Αἰκανῶν ἐλήφθη, &c. [cap. 47.]

g De Bell. Peloponnesiac. lib. i. cap.

141. Καὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν ὡς μάλιστα τιμωρήσασθαι τὰ βούλονται, οἱ δὲ, ὡς ἤκιστα τὰ οἰκεία φθεῖραι. Χρόνιοι τε ξυνιόντες, ἐν βραχεὶ μὲν μορίῳ σκοποῦσιν τι τῶν κοινῶν, τῷ δὲ πλείονι τὰ οἰκεία πράσσουσι. Καὶ ἕκαστος οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀμέλειαν οἶεται βλάψειν, &c.



Mr. Wall's conclusion from hence is fair, I do not know what is otherwise. For,

1. What can be more evident than that he does not say baptism is the Christian circumcision, but only that Christians receive the spiritual circumcision, whatever it is, by baptism? which is far from saying baptism itself is it. By baptism we receive the remission of our sins; but how absurd would it be therefore to say, remission of sins is nothing else but baptism? What we receive is not the instrument or medium by which we receive it. We receive all things by the mercy of God in Christ; and yet those things are not that divine perfection we call the mercy of God, but only the effects and consequences of it. In like manner, we are not to abuse St. Justin and his words so much as to fancy he meant, that the spiritual circumcision he says we receive by baptism, is baptism itself. Nay,

2. He plainly shews he meant no such thing: for the circumcision which he opposes to the Jewish in the flesh, he expressly says is that 'which Enoch, and those like him, observed;' and yet he says, we have received the same by baptism. No man sure can really think he means only baptism by all this; for when, where, and by whom, was Enoch baptized?

And the martyr often talks directly contrary to our author's gloss; of which I will produce some instances, to let you see how much Mr. Wall misrepresents him. Thus he distinguishes between baptism and the Christian circumcision, when he explains, *Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings*, Isaiah i. 16, and says, 'God commands you to wash with this laver, and to be circumcised 'with the true circumcision<sup>b</sup>.' The true circumcision answers here directly to the putting away the evil of their doings, and not to their washing. As washing and putting away the evil, &c., are two different things; so baptism, which according to St. Justin answers to one, and circumcision, which answers to the other, must be different likewise: and what the true circumcision consists in, the following words of Isaiah teach us, *cease to do evil*, ver. 17, *learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed*, &c. And if all this is included in the true circumcision, according to St. Justin, how can any one say he took baptism to be that circumcision? and which he afterwards calls *our circumcision*<sup>i</sup>?

In another place he says, 'Let a man be a Scythian or a Persian, 'if he receive the knowledge of God and his Christ, and observe the

<sup>b</sup> Dialog. p. 235 D. Λούσασθε οὖν, καὶ νῦν καθαροὶ γένησθε, καὶ ἀφέλεσθε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. ὥς δὲ λούσασθαι ὑμῖν τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν κελεύει ὁ Θεός, καὶ

περιτέμνεσθαι τὴν ἀληθινὴν περιτομήν. [sect. 18.]

<sup>i</sup> Dialog. p. 236 C. [sect. 19.]

‘ eternal rules of justice, he is circumcised with an excellent and ‘ useful circumcision<sup>k</sup>,’ &c. And in the very next page before that which our author takes his citation from, we have this description of the true circumcision. ‘ The precept of circumcision, which commands to circumcise infants on the eighth day, was but a type of that true circumcision with which we are circumcised from error and wickedness, by him who rose from the dead the first day of the week ; Jesus Christ our Lord!’ And again, ‘ He (viz. Joshua) is said in the second circumcision to circumcise the people with knives of stone, (Josh. v. 2, &c.) which signifies this circumcision wherewith Jesus Christ has circumcised us, from the worshipping of stones and idols.—We are circumcised from the deceitfulness of this world with knives of stone, that is, by the word of our Lord Jesus.—By knives of stone we are to understand the doctrine of Christ ; by which so many of the uncircumcised, who were once deceived, are now circumcised with the circumcision of the heart<sup>m</sup>,’ &c. And in the next page, ‘ Happy are we who are circumcised with knives of stone in this second circumcision :—But our circumcision, which is the second, and takes place after yours, is performed with sharp stones ; that is, by the doctrines of the chief corner-stone preached by the apostles, who was cut out without hands, and has circumcised us from idolatry and all manner of evil. Whose hearts are so circumcised from all wickedness<sup>n</sup>,’ &c.

And whatever may be pretended, the primitive church generally talk after the same manner ; Irenæus uses almost the same words, and tells us, ‘ The circumcision in the flesh prefigured the circumcision of the heart<sup>o</sup>.’ And Origen, without any mention of baptism, says, ‘ He who lays aside his false notions and evil imaginations, circumcises the foreskin of his heart<sup>p</sup>.’ There is a great deal more to this purpose in the same place, which I will not transcribe. Tertullian, in like manner, without giving the least intimation that

<sup>k</sup> Dialog. p. 246 A. [sect. 28.]

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. p. 260 C. ‘ Ἡ δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς, κελεύουσα τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ παντὸς περιτέμνειν τὰ γεννώμενα, τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς περιτομῆς ἣν περιετέμθημεν ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ πονηρίας διὰ τοῦ ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέρᾳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. [sect. 41.]

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. p. 341 A. [sect. 113.]

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. p. 342 A. Μακάριοι οὖν ἡμεῖς οἱ περιτεμθέντες πετρίναις μαχαίραις τὴν δευτέραν περιτομήν.—ἡμῶν δὲ ἡ περιτομή, ἥτις δευτέρα ἀριθμῶ, μετὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν φανε-

ρωθεῖσα, διὰ λίθων ἀκροτόμων, τουτέστι, διὰ τῶν λόγων τῶν διὰ ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀκρογωνίου λίθου, καὶ τοῦ ἄνευ χειρῶν τηθέντος, περιτέμνει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τε εἰδωλολατρίας καὶ πάσης ἀπλῶς κακίας. Ὡν αἱ καρδίαι οὕτως, &c. [sect. 114.]

<sup>o</sup> Advers. Hæres. lib. iv. cap. 30. p. 319 a. Secundum carnem circumcisio circumcissionem præfigurabat spiritalem.

<sup>p</sup> Homil. v. in Hierem. p. 86 D. Ὁ ἀποτιθέμενος τὴν ψευδοδοξίαν, περιτέμνηται τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, &c. [Sect. 15. edit. Benedict.]

baptism is the Christian circumcision, which succeeds in the stead of that in the flesh, says, 'As therefore the carnal circumcision, which was but for a time, was given for a sign to a stubborn and rebellious people; so the spiritual is given for the salvation of the obedient, as the prophet Jeremiah says, *Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your hearts*,' chap. iv. 4. And so Lactantius says, 'And the Lord said to Jesus or Joshua, 'Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time; foreshewing there was to be another circumcision, not of the flesh, as was the first, which the Jews still practise: but of the heart and spirit, which is given by Christ the true Jesus.' You see, sir, he expressly says the second circumcision 'is not of the flesh;' but baptism is plunging the flesh into water, and is therefore of the flesh, and cannot be the second circumcision. There is no colour of reason therefore for any to pretend that the ancients, and particularly St. Justin, ever imagined baptism succeeds to us instead of circumcision.

But here our author, after his usual method, compares St. Justin's words with a place of Scripture, which is as wrongly applied as the rest. 'It (the passage of St. Justin) is to the same sense,' says our author, 'as is that saying of St. Paul, where he calls baptism, with the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which attends it, the circumcision of Christ's.' And here he cites Coloss. ii. 11, 12. But it is a great mistake to say, St. Paul, by circumcision here, means baptism. For,

1. The Scriptures nowhere call baptism circumcision, nor afford us any ground to imagine so; and to say that baptism is intended by it here, is saying a thing at pleasure, and offering as great violence to the words as can well be imagined. For something very different from the washing of the body in water is frequently in Scripture called circumcision, and opposed to the legal circumcision of the Jews; and the Scriptures speak of no circumcision, but either that under the law in the flesh, or the spiritual in the heart, &c. Even the prophets under the Jewish economy mention this circumcision, as well as the writers of the New Testament.

<sup>q</sup> Advers. Judæos, p. 186 A. Sicut ergo circumcisio carnalis, quæ temporalis erat, tributa est in signum populo contumaci, ita spiritalis data est in salutem populo obaudienti, dicente propheta Hieremia; innovate vobis novitatem, &c. [cap. 4.]

<sup>r</sup> De vera Sapientia, lib. iv. p. 405. Et

dixit Dominus ad Jesum; fac tibi cultellos petrinus nimis acutos, &c. Secundam circumcisionem futuram esse dixit, non carnis; sicut fuit prima, qua etiam nunc Judæi utuntur; sed cordis, ac spiritus, quam tradidit Christus, qui verus Jesus fuit. [cap. 17.]

<sup>s</sup> Part i. p. 13. [40.]



Now if baptism is never called circumcision in Scripture; but something else, viz. purity of heart, &c., is frequently so called; how natural and necessary does it appear to understand the circumcision, Coloss. ii. 11, to mean, not baptism, but purity of heart, &c.? For the analogy of Scripture has always been thought the chief rule of interpretation, and I think our adversaries can fortify their exposition by no argument from reason, nor so much as one single text of Scripture. But,

2. In the next place, the words themselves effectually exclude that acceptation; for they so particularly characterize the circumcision there spoken of, that it cannot be questioned what is meant by it; and I am amazed to see that men of so much sense and learning as many of the pædobaptists are, can (notwithstanding all the care St. Paul has taken to be understood) mistake his meaning. The circumcision Christians are to regard, he says, is *made without hands*; now baptism is not *made without hands*, and therefore cannot be this circumcision, unless he resolves all into the Quaker's internal baptism only. This circumcision is opposed to the Jewish in this respect, particularly, that theirs was made *with hands*, and this *without*; but if he meant baptism, it can no more be said to be made without hands than the Jews' circumcision in the flesh; and therefore the Christian circumcision here intended must have this difference from the Jewish, that it cannot be anything external or relating to the flesh, any further than it is, as St. Paul afterwards says, *by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh*; and serves to explain yet more particularly wherein this circumcision made without hands consists, viz. in such internal operations of God's holy Spirit on the mind of man, whereby the heart is purified from inward filth and evil inclinations. This is sometimes expressed by putting off the old man, and putting on the new, Ephes. iv. 22, and Coloss. iii. 9, 10; and this, you know, is the circumcision St. Paul commonly opposes to the Jewish; as Gal. vi. 15, where arguing against the laws being then in force, he says, *Neither circumcision availeth any thing nor uncircumcision, but a new creature*. And again, Rom. ii. 29, *Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit*. Since then St. Paul so plainly specifies the circumcision here meant, and characterises it by such marks as agree only to the internal one of the heart; and withal constantly opposes this circumcision of the heart to the Jewish, and never mentions a third: what can incline any man, contrary to the analogy of Scripture, the particular signs expressed in the words, and without any necessity, to impose this strange sense on this single place of St. Paul?



The circumcision here called Christian must be either wholly internal or wholly external, or partly both. It cannot be partly internal and partly external, (which our author pretty plainly asserts,) because, if it consists of these two parts, one whereof may be performed without hands and the other not, it cannot be called circumcision without hands; for, in order to make it complete, another part is necessary which must be performed with hands, and what is true of any one part cannot be denied of the whole; and therefore if the Christian circumcision does but partly consist of what must be performed with hands, it is not a circumcision without hands, which is directly contrary to St. Paul's assertion. And our adversaries will grant, this circumcision cannot be wholly external: it remains therefore that it must be a circumcision wholly internal, and consequently it cannot be baptism.

Here Mr. Wall tells us, the ancients were wont to call baptism the circumcision done without hands. By this information doubtless he hopes to persuade some that St. Paul calls it so too, because the inward part was performed without hands. Does Mr. Wall mean, that for this reason the outward part was called circumcision without hands? If he does not mean so, he trifles, for it is of the outward ceremony we are disputing; and if he does mean so, we have a greater deference for St. Paul than to think he talks at such a rate, and a more honourable opinion of the ancients than to suppose they could be so grossly absurd as to say, the external ceremony of baptism was performed without hands. The passages of the ancients our author refers to I have consulted particularly, and I am sure they say no such thing.

Besides, if they, and even St. Paul too, did commonly speak of baptism as Mr. Wall pretends, how does this affect infant-baptism? Which way can he contrive an inference to prove from thence that infants are to be baptized? It must be thus: if baptism succeeds to us instead of circumcision, then it follows, as infants were ordered under the law to receive the Jewish circumcision, so now, though it be not ordered, they must be circumcised under the gospel, with the Christian circumcision; that is, they must be baptized. I have proposed the argument very fairly; and yet you may observe, sir, how plainly it points us to the solution which is contained in it. For there is this difference however, that infants were ordered to be circumcised under Moses; but were not ordered to be circumcised, that is, baptized, under Christ: therefore I answer, under Moses they ought to be circumcised, because it was expressly ordered; but under Christ, they are not to be baptized, because it is not ordered.

So great a difference in the two institutions should be thought enough to justify so necessary a difference in the practice. For the parallel between circumcision and baptism failing in this particular, the argument drawn from it, which cannot extend beyond the parallel it is founded on, must also fail.

But farther: the principle upon which the pædobaptists go in arguing from this topic must be this; that what was done and observed in respect to circumcision under the law, must be done and observed now in respect to baptism under the Gospel. If any plain intimation could be found, that infants particularly are to be initiated now by baptism, as formerly they were by circumcision, the dispute would be at an end, and we need go no farther back: but since there is no such particular instruction, the whole must at last depend upon the general principle mentioned.

Now if this be false, as no man that reads it can deny but it is, then all that is built upon it must of course fall to the ground.

Some of the consequences of this principle are these:

1. Circumcision was to be performed on the eighth day precisely; it was not to be deferred longer upon any pretence, nor to be administered before, though in the utmost danger of death: accordingly, the Jews suffered their children to die uncircumcised rather than do it before the time. Baptism therefore, by this rule, must be always administered on the eighth day precisely, and neither before nor after on any account whatever. And yet this is contrary to the opinion and practice of the pædobaptists.

2. But what more immediately affects our present dispute is to observe, that the females were not to be circumcised, and therefore now they are not to be baptized; for those only who were to be circumcised then are the subjects of baptism now: and this is not only the principle our antagonists go upon, but their very argument too. And therefore, if it proves infants are proper subjects from the analogy, it equally proves the male infants only are proper subjects. If one was to follow the argument in every particular, what confused work would it make!

In a word, then, it undoubtedly follows, that whatever principle leads to such wild, extravagant conclusions, is absurd, and ought to be disowned.

But now, if Mr. Wall and the pædobaptists will grant, that we are not to judge from the subjects of circumcision precisely to those of baptism, they give up their own argument; or if they will stand by this argument, they must deny baptism to females. But I know

they will depart from the rule in these cases, and we claim the same allowance to depart from it in the other too.

But they will tell us, the apostles varied in these and such like particulars, which is warrant enough for them to do so too: they baptized not males only, but females also, men and women. All this is very true; and the apostles varied also in another particular, viz. that whereas infants were used to be circumcised, they admitted none but the adult to baptism. And hence we infer, that they did not make circumcision their pattern in any thing relating to baptism: why then should our adversaries plead for any agreement between these two symbols, only in this circumstance? For they allow the apostles observed no agreement between them in any other particular. And does it not at last from all plainly appear, that it is with the greatest reason we assert the Scripture and ancient Christians do not pretend to run a parallel between circumcision and baptism; and that, if they had in some respects, it could not be concluded from thence that infants are to be baptized? All the objections and pretences about circumcision therefore must be manifestly invalid; and I am persuaded, if the clergy themselves were to consider the matter more deliberately, they would be ashamed of all they have urged from this head.

Let us proceed now to our author's next citation from St. Justin, which is that part of the first Apology, wherein the martyr gives the Roman emperor an account of the Christian initiation by baptism. It is too long to be transcribed: you may read it in St. Justin himself, or in Mr. Wall's history; for it is a noble piece of antiquity, and indeed so is the whole Apology. If this made for pædobaptism, it would be very considerable, and do a great deal more than has been yet done in the argument of antiquity: but Mr. Wall himself confesses it does not prove infants are to be baptized, and therefore supposes his readers will wonder what he means by producing it here; in answer to which he tells us, he does not produce it for that purpose. St. Justin introduces the account he gives of baptism thus: 'lest,' says he, 'if I should leave out this, I might seem to deal unfairly in some part of my Apology.' If he was so cautious then, not to seem unfair, in hiding any thing from the powers before whom he pleaded; it is strange he should entirely omit, without the least intimation, so important an article as the custom of baptizing infants, if it had been practised at that time.

The heathens were apt enough to charge the Christians with using infants very barbarously: it concerned St. Justin therefore

not to give any umbrage, by seeming to avoid the mentioning of them. So careful an apologist would certainly have taken occasion to mention them, and describe the Christians' treatment of them very exactly, in order to remove all suspicions from the emperor's mind. When they were reported to murder infants, or make some impious use of their blood, what could possibly fortify the suspicion more, than that so great a man as St. Justin should, in a public and formal apology, decline saying any thing at all of what they did to them? It was altogether necessary therefore for St. Justin, at least, to have taken some notice of infants, if they had used any ceremony about them; and therefore it is wrong in Mr. Wall to say, 'He had no occasion to speak of the case of infants.'

But supposing he had not, must he therefore describe baptism in such a manner as cannot be at all applicable to the case of infants, as he has done? This would have been directly deceiving the emperor, who certainly understood St. Justin's account to be full and true of baptism in general, and never imagined the Christians baptized otherwise. But Mr. Wall supposes the Christian church at that time had two baptisms, as the Church of England has at present, namely, one of adult persons, here described by St. Justin, and another of infants different from that. And therefore he intimates, that what St. Justin says here might agree to adult persons, but cannot be applied to the case of infants.

A man that will take this liberty may say any thing with as much reason. It is true, indeed, what St. Justin says can only be applied to adult-baptism: but that the martyr should prevaricate with the emperor, and not speak of baptism in general as administered to all, but only in some cases, is unworthy his sincerity, and altogether an unreasonable conjecture: for St. Justin, I am sure, affords him no ground for this distinction; who, with primitive candour and simplicity, gives an impartial full account of the administration of baptism in general, and so as to reach all cases. Upon these considerations, I think, it must be plain to any impartial judge, that if this passage of St. Justin does not make for infant-baptism, but relates only to the adult, by Mr. Wall's own confession, then it must make strongly against it: for had there been such a thing as infant-baptism at that time, how easy had it been for St. Justin, and how necessary, to have said, not only 'they who are persuaded and do believe,' &c., but also to have added, 'together with their infant children, are baptized?'

But there is another thing, even in the words, which directly



opposes infant-baptism; the words I particularly refer to our author translates thus: 'And we have been taught by the apostles this reason for this thing; because we, being ignorant of our first birth, were generated by necessity, &c., that we should not continue children of that necessity and ignorance, but of will (or choice) and knowledge; and should obtain forgiveness of the sins in which we have lived, by water,' &c. Nothing can be plainer than that the new birth, together with the remission of sins to be obtained by water, is here said to depend not upon any necessity, or the will of another, as our being born into this world did; but, on the contrary, on our own wills, or free choice and knowledge; for the opposition lies here; we were at first generated *without* our knowledge or choice; but we must be regenerated, and obtain the remission of our sins by water, *with* our own knowledge and choice. And this shews that infants, who are not capable of that knowledge and choice, are consequently not capable of this baptism: if they are to be baptized, it must be without their choice, as much as their first generation was: which destroys St. Justin's opposition, and therefore must be thought inconsistent with his notion of the matter.

Or however, supposing this were not so plain, we are at least upon equal terms with Mr. Wall as to this passage, since he confesses it does not make *for* infant-baptism. One would be apt to think therefore it was impertinently cited; but our author tells us, he produces it upon these three accounts:

1. 'Because this is the most ancient *and best* account of the way of baptizing, next the Scripture,' &c., and he notes that many Christians of those times had lived 'in the apostles' days;' intimating, their way was the more likely to be the same with that of the apostles: and if so, our author must allow, that those who come nearest in practice to this account of St. Justin are to be accounted most in the right, and to administer the ordinance in the greatest purity. Now it is plain to any who read St. Justin's words, especially when they are compared with what he says in other places, that baptism was at that time administered by dipping; the consequence of which is, that not those who *sprinkle* or *pour*, but those who *dip*, retain the true apostolic way.

In the next place, St. Justin here mentions only adult persons, and elsewhere plainly excludes infants from being then baptized in the church; and says, that adult persons only can or ought to be baptized: and therefore again, not those who admit infants, but those who admit adult persons only, who actually believe, &c., agree

exactly with St. Justin and the Christian church of his time, and consequently with the apostles too. Thus, from this first note of Mr. Wall, it follows that the antipædobaptists here in England, who dip the adult only, are in the right; and that the pædobaptists, whom he goes about to defend, are as wide of the truth in these points, as being directly contrary to it can make them.

2. The second (and perhaps the chief) reason for Mr. Wall's citing this passage is, 'because' he fancies 'it shews that the Christians of these times used the word *regeneration* for baptism.' This remark is providently laid down against a proper time: for you will find our author has occasion afterwards to prove this assertion. But this passage of St. Justin is far from doing him that service he intends; for though he talks of their being regenerated, and joins it pretty closely with their being baptized, yet he does not say baptism is regeneration: but only intimates that they received, or completed, or confirmed, &c., that regeneration by baptism: and as he is speaking only of adult persons, he must doubtless mean some further regeneration than bare washing. The passage, I confess, is a little obscurely expressed; but however, in this sense only it is agreeable with St. Justin's doctrine, as an example or two may satisfy you.

In his Dialogue with Trypho he says, 'Christ is become the head of another people, who are regenerated by him by water, faith, and the tree<sup>u</sup>,' &c. As Mr. Wall argues, regenerated here must signify *baptized*; and then the passage runs thus, which were 'baptized of him by water, faith, and the tree,' that is, the cross. But when did our Saviour baptize by water, &c.? And what sense is there in that expression, *baptize by faith*? &c.; regenerated plainly means something else, which, he says, was done by Christ; and therefore he cannot intend baptism, which is not administered by Christ personally: or if baptism is said to be administered by Christ, as it is done by his command, and by his disciples, as John iv. 1, 2, yet we are said here to be regenerated *by* or *through* water, as a symbol, not as the thing itself; for it is not said *in* water.

Besides, the regeneration is placed in *faith*, and in the *cross*, as well as in *water*; and yet faith, strictly speaking, is not regeneration, but only a means of it; and so likewise is baptism, &c. And the cross, or Christ's sufferings, or what else may be thought is here intended by it, cannot be our regeneration, but only a means of it.

We have another plain instance to this purpose in this very

<sup>u</sup> Page 367 D. Ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονεν τοῦ ἀναγεννηθέντος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δι' ὕδατος, καὶ πίστεως, καὶ ξύλου, &c. [Sect. 138.]

Apology, and but a little after the words Mr. Wall transcribes ; where, speaking of the sacred supper, the martyr says, ‘ Of which it ‘ is not lawful for any to partake, but such as believe the things we ‘ teach, and are baptized for the remission of their sins, and regene- ‘ ration<sup>x</sup>,’ &c. This manifestly shews that St. Justin thought baptism was for regeneration, just as it is for the remission of sins ; but as baptism is not the remission of sins, so neither is it regeneration. That the martyr says, ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως, but εἰς ἀναγέννησιν, is no objection ; for ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως is doubtless the same in sense with St. Peter’s εἰς ἄφεσιν, Acts ii. 38, and therefore it is all one as if St. Justin, who was indeed not very exact in his language, had said εἰς ἄφεσιν. It appears then from hence, St. Justin only thought that we, somehow or other, obtained or sealed, &c., our regeneration by baptism, as a mean or sign, &c., just as we also obtain remission of sins thereby, but not that baptism is remission of sins or regeneration : and therefore he is to be thus only understood, and not as our author would fain understand him.

3. The third thing for which Mr. Wall cites this passage of St. Justin is, ‘ because,’ says he, ‘ we see by it that they understood ‘ that rule of our Saviour, *Except a man* &c., of water-baptism, and ‘ concluded from it that without such baptism no person could come ‘ to heaven.’ But how strangely does Mr. Wall treat his readers ? One while he would have us believe St. Justin speaks here only of adult persons converted from heathenism ; but now you are, all on a sudden, to suppose he means infants as well as adult : for Mr. Wall’s design in this note is, to have us believe that St. Justin asserts, no person, whether adult or infant, can be saved without baptism. But upon Mr. Wall’s own concession (and it is also too manifest to be denied), the martyr intends no such thing, but only that all adult persons who hear the word preached and believe, for of such only he speaks, ought to be baptized in order to their being made partakers of the kingdom.

The next citation Mr. Wall produces out of this Father is taken from the same Apology with the former, and he translates it thus : ‘ Several persons among us of sixty and seventy years old, of both ‘ sexes, who were discipled to Christ in their childhood, do continue ‘ uncorrupted.’ His argument from these words is this, that many were discipled to Christ in their childhood, and therefore children may be discipled ; and the word used by St. Matthew, ch. xxviii. 19, which is the same as is used here, does not mean *to teach*, but *to*

<sup>x</sup> Page 97 D. Ἐς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχῶν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῶς εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ’ ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ

ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, &c. [Apolog. i. sect. 66. edit. Benedict.]

*disciple* in such manner as children are capable of. Nay, if it be true that St. Justin wrote this but one hundred years after St. Matthew, and that some infants had been baptized seventy years before he wrote, it follows that infants were baptized within the apostolic age, and even while most of the apostles were yet living. Which is a formidable argument indeed: but I beg you, sir, to observe the whole force of it depends upon our author's misrepresentation of the words, which is beyond excuse.

As to *μαθητεύω*, I have largely proved from its use in Greek authors, from the sense in which the Fathers understood the commission, from most if not all the versions, and from the consent of several of the most learned critics, that it necessarily includes *teaching* in its signification. The whole stress of what our author advances to the contrary from these words of St. Justin lies in the sense of the phrase *ἐκ παιδων*; which Mr. Wall, that the passage might serve his turn, has unfairly rendered 'in their childhood.' To convince therefore the most prejudiced, I shall shew the disingenuity of our author's version more largely than so obvious a matter requires; for every body knows well enough that *ἐκ παιδων* signifies not *in* but *from* their childhood; just as it is said of St. Timothy, *that from a child*, or from his infancy, as it strictly signifies, he had *known the holy Scriptures*: not that it can be thought he understood them in his infancy, but only from his infancy he had been training up in the knowledge of them.

So Cicero speaks of being 'brought up in good learning (*per omnem pueritiam*) from one's tenderest infancy<sup>z</sup>.' And in another place, speaking of Diodotus the Stoic, he says, 'under whom I studied (*a puero*) from a child<sup>a</sup>.' Instances of this kind are common; but I must confine myself to the Greek writers. Laertius says of Xenocrates the Dull, of Chalcedon, 'that he studied under Plato (*ἐκ νέου*) from his infancy<sup>b</sup>.' Socrates says of the daemon which attended him, 'By some divine direction a certain daemon has continued to attend me, beginning from my infancy (*ἐκ παιδός*)<sup>c</sup>;' and so Ficinus translates it, *a prima pueritia*. And thus also Plutarch says of Cato Minor, that he was observed (*ἐκ παιδός*) even 'from his childhood, in his voice, and countenance, and in his play, to be of an inflexible, morose, and obstinate disposition<sup>d</sup>.'

To add some Fathers of the Christian church too: Origen says, 'They who are called to do the works of the kingdom of God (*ἐκ*

<sup>y</sup> 2 Tim. iii. 15.

<sup>z</sup> Ad Herenn. lib. iii. p. 46 b.

<sup>a</sup> Academ. Quæst. lib. iv. cap. 34. p. 302 b.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. iv. in Vita ejus. [Op. tom. i. p. 230. ed. Meibomii.]

<sup>c</sup> Platon. Theag. p. 93.

<sup>d</sup> In ejus Vit. p. 1393.



‘παίδων, καὶ πρώτης ἡλικίας) from their childhood and earliest days, ‘are those whom the householder hired early in the morning<sup>e</sup>,’ Matt. xx. 1, &c. And a little after, in the same page, ‘They who ‘have been faithful (ἐκ παίδων) from their childhood, who have ‘laboured, and with pains have kept a check upon the extravagancies of youth, think much that they should receive no greater ‘reward than others, who were idle as to religion till they grew old, ‘and have received and done the works of faith but a little time.’

And Theophilus Antiochenus says, that Epicurus and the Stoics taught incest and defilements with mankind, and had filled the libraries with those impure doctrines, ‘that persons might (ἐκ παίδων ‘μαρθάνειν) from their childhood learn and be educated to such ‘unlawful conversation<sup>f</sup>.’ In the *Pædagogus*, St. Clemens Alexandrinus defines *pædagogus* to be ‘a good institution in virtue from the ‘childhoods’ (ἐκ παίδων).

And to add yet some instances from Scripture, Samuel tells the Israelites he had *walked before them* (ἐκ νεότητος) *from his childhood, unto that day*<sup>h</sup>. And Job, xxxi. 18, *I have guided her from my mother’s womb.* The royal prophet, Psalm lxxi. 5, *Thou art my trust* (ἐκ νεότητός μου) *from my youth.* And again, ver. 17, *O God, thou hast taught me* (ἐκ νεότητός μου) *from my youth.* And the young man whom Christ had directed to keep the commandments makes him this answer, *Master, all these have I observed* (ἐκ νεότητός μου) *from my youth,* Mark x. 20.

After all this I need make no further comment, for no mortal can doubt but the passage in St. Justin ought to have been rendered thus: ‘Several persons among us of sixty or seventy years of age, of ‘both sexes, who had been trained up in the Christian religion, or ‘instructed in Christ, from their childhood, do continue’ &c. And this is exactly as Mr. Wall himself too has rendered the same phrase, when he was on another matter, and did not think it weakened his argument; it is in a passage taken out of St. Basil’s *Exhortation to Baptism*, which our author cites and translates, part i. p. 100. [131.] thus: ‘When you have been (ἐκ νηπίου) from a child catechised in ‘the word, are you not yet acquainted with the truth?’ As in this place St. Basil, by our author’s own confession, speaks to such as had been ‘catechised from their childhood;’ so St. Justin, in the other, speaks of such as had been ‘instructed from their childhood.’ And therefore our author has dealt here a little unfairly with St.

<sup>e</sup> In Matt. p. 406 C. [Comm. tom. xv. sect. 36. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>f</sup> Ad Autolyce. lib. iii. p. 120 D.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. i. cap. 5. p. 87 B.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Sam. xii. 2.

Justin; and it is plain that these words, with the other passages he cites from that Father, are really nothing to his purpose.

I should now, sir, shew you that St. Justin is so far from saying any thing in favour of infant-baptism, that he frequently enough uses expressions and reasonings which declare he believed nothing of the matter. But, as I am to answer Mr. Wall, my business is only to confute his arguments, which I hope you think I have fairly done hitherto.

Next follows St. Irenæus, in our author's quotations, and here we are to attack the strongest hold of our adversaries. But, by the way, let us observe that Mr. Wall confesses, 'this is the first express mention that we have met with of infants baptized.' Now this being wrote by his own confession about one hundred and eighty years after Christ, all that has been cited before that time cannot signify much; and the baptism of infants does not appear to have been practised, at best, till about the latter end of the second century. Nor have the paedobaptists yet proved it was practised then, for this passage from Irenæus no more proves it than you see the other earlier citations have done.

It is true, many people have thought this passage plain and full to the purpose, for what, say they, can be more express than these words, 'He came to save all persons by himself; all I mean, who by him are regenerated unto God, infants and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons?' For as infants are expressly mentioned here, and said to be saved by Christ by being regenerated unto God by him; this they say must be thought an unexceptionable instance, that infant-baptism was spoken of as a thing commonly practised in St. Irenæus' time.

But to give this passage the weight they pretend it has, they ought to have proved that St. Irenæus does certainly say thus, which is very doubtful upon two accounts. 1. It is questioned whether the passage be genuine, or rather it seems to be undeniably spurious. Cardinal Baronius<sup>h</sup> observed this above one hundred years ago; and, I think, the reasons he gives have never been answered yet.

1. He notes, that the latter part of the chapter, from whence the words are taken, contradicts the beginning; for to say Christ was baptized at about 30, and to enumerate three passovers after that, in the last of which he suffered, is as plain an argument that Christ suffered about 33 as can be desired; and yet, in the latter part of the same chapter, it is pretended Christ lived till above 50. If St. Irenæus was guilty of so palpable a contradiction, he must have

<sup>h</sup> Annal. Ecclesiast. An. 34.

been strangely inconsiderate, and not to be trusted in any case; and then his testimony, though ever so full, is justly contemned. But since both sides agree the holy Father could not fall into so gross a blunder, I infer, with the cardinal, the latter part of this chapter is not his.

Casauboni<sup>i</sup> quarrels with Baronius upon this occasion, but says nothing to defend the passage. And what Petavius<sup>k</sup> has offered against him, which is the most I have seen, amounts to nothing, if duly considered. He owns all the Cardinal urges; for indeed St. Irenæus is express as to the time of our Lord's baptism, and the three passovers mentioned which were after his baptism: but because St. Irenæus does not particularly say, the first of these three did commence with the next after his baptism, therefore Petavius imagines St. Irenæus thought there were several passovers between his baptism and the first of these three which are mentioned. But since he does not attempt to prove this, it is too wild and fanciful a conjecture to pass, and founded purely on Petavius' imagination. And the only reason Petavius has to imagine this, he himself tells us is, because 'otherwise St. Irenæus contradicts himself<sup>l</sup>:' which is very pleasant indeed. For this is the Cardinal's assertion, and Petavius should not have supposed the contrary, and then argued from his supposition, for that is only begging the question. In short, Petavius allows the whole force of the Cardinal's argument, that the beginning and end of this chapter are contradictory, unless it can be proved to be probable, that these three passovers are not the three immediately following upon our Lord's baptism, which I do not see how any man will ever be able to do.

2. Another reason the annalist gives to render this place of Irenæus suspected is, that the author of the last part of the chapter would confirm so manifest a falsehood by the authority of the ancients, who he pretends received it immediately from St. John himself and other apostles; for Baronius thinks the fancy is too notoriously false and ridiculous (as likewise all men will allow it is) to be contained in the Scriptures, or affirmed by any of the ancients Irenæus could refer to, and more especially by St. John and other apostles, who could not be mistaken in a matter which even we at this time know so well.

Mr. Dodwell<sup>m</sup>, not with any apparent design upon this argument of the Cardinal's, but in answer to some others, who make a differ-

<sup>i</sup> Exercitat. 16. ad An. 34. num. 142.

<sup>k</sup> Animadv. in Epiphan. Hæres. 51.

<sup>l</sup> Alioqui constare ipse sibi non potest.  
[See Petavius' edition of Epiphanius, fol.

Paris. 1622. tom. ii. part 2. p. 146, in the chapter headed 'De anno et die dominicæ passionis—diatriba altera.'

<sup>m</sup> Dissertat. in Irenæum, i. § 45. p. 81, 82.

ent use of the passage, would have us believe that St. John, &c., from whom Pseudo-Irenæus pretends to have derived his opinion, only judged by his countenance, that our Lord was arrived to the beginning, at least, of old age ; which, St. Irenæus, according to the division of ages in his time, understood to be toward fifty years. But if the Fathers are capable of such gross errors in fact, all Mr. Dodwell says so learnedly in that dissertation will signify nothing ; because, notwithstanding his distinction, if by *reasoning*, or any other way, they mistake and assert what is in *fact* false, their testimony cannot be relied on even as to *facts* ; the point Mr. Dodwell so strenuously labours to carry. And how unlikely is it that St. John and the apostles should content themselves with barely guessing at our Saviour's age by his looks ; when nothing was more easy than to know it more exactly, and upon better grounds ? Nay, they could not but know it ; for doubtless they had often heard, and as often related, the wonderful manner of his birth, with the strange events that attended it. The time of Augustus' taxing the whole world, and Herod's barbarous massacre of the children, &c., were fresh in their memory : and what is more common or natural, than for people to inquire how long ago such or such a thing they are told of was done ? And that they should not have this curiosity in so important a concern as the birth, &c. of Christ, is altogether incredible.

It is not to be supposed therefore, that St. Irenæus received, or says he received, so false an account of our Lord's age from the apostles : and consequently that part of the chapter, as it now stands, is none of his.

3. To the reasons of Baronius it may be added, that St. Irenæus could not but know better than to think Christ arrived so much as near the fortieth year, much less the fiftieth. The apostles certainly knew the time of our Lord's meritorious passion, for they were disconsolate eyewitnesses of it. And the time of his birth they could no more be ignorant of, than any true Englishman can forget the happy period when his late glorious Majesty<sup>a</sup> bravely rescued three nations from popery and arbitrary power, and secured the throne to our present most gracious Queen, whose succession is the greatest blessing that has followed upon that generous attempt ; in that it makes all firm and lasting during her sacred Majesty's life at least : which may God of his infinite goodness lengthen out by a numerous addition of happy years, and at last reward her steady piety and justice with an inconceivably happier eternity !

<sup>a</sup> [William III. at the revolution in 1688.]



If then the apostles knew the time of our Lord's birth, and the time of his death, of consequence they knew how old he was at that time. And they with whom they immediately conversed had undoubtedly often heard them relate the whole, and could not but know then the precise times when he was born, and when he died. Thus we find two of the disciples, as they were going to Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 14, *talking together of all these things which had happened*; and afterwards, ver. 21, noting to the supposed stranger the particular time they were done.

Now St. Irenæus himself tells us he had seen and learned many things from some who had conversed with the apostles. There is a very remarkable fragment of his epistle to Florinus to this purpose, preserved by Eusebius, which runs thus : ‘ I saw you when I was a young man in the Lower Asia with Polycarp, making a notable figure in the emperor's court, and endeavouring to gain his esteem; for I remember what was done then, better than what has been done in later times, (for what we learn in our youth grows up with our mind, and sinks deeply into it.) So that I could describe the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and discoursed, his going out and coming in, his manner of life, and his person; his discourses to the people, and the familiar converse he said he had with St. John and others who had seen the Lord; and how he rehearsed their discourses, and what he had heard them who had been eye-witnesses of the word of life relate of our Lord, and of his miracles and doctrines, in all exactly agreeing with the Scriptures. And these things, which then by the goodness of God were offered to me, I heard diligently, and committed them to memory, not in paper, but in my heart. And by the grace of God, I do continually run them over in my mind distinctly<sup>o</sup>.’

In an age so nigh the apostles, persons who had the advantage which St. Irenæus, by his own words, appears to have had, cannot possibly be supposed to have been ignorant of our Lord's age; for it is observable in the passage just now translated, that St. Irenæus had taken such particular notice of Polycarp, that he remembered even the very place he sat in, and all the most minute circumstances; and very diligently heard the accounts he gave of his conversation with the apostles, and of the many things he had heard them relate of the Lord and his doctrines. And as the Father attended to all these things with the utmost eagerness, so he had treasured them up in his memory with the greatest care and fidelity. And is it to be imagined that persons, so zealous and so nice in their

<sup>o</sup> Euseb. Histor. Eccles. lib. v. cap. 20.

observations, should not keep a tolerable account of the age, that is, the birth and passion of their adored Redeemer?

Besides, as it might easily be, so it was commonly known from the censual rolls of Augustus, both at what time and in what place our Lord was born. Justin Martyr, in his Apology to the emperor, appeals to these rolls; and Tertullian, speaking of them as things sufficiently known, calls them ‘faithful witnesses of the birth of ‘Christ.’ And, in the beginning of Christianity, before and after St. Irenæus, in the disputes with their adversaries, the Christians were wont to prove from the prophets when Christ was to appear; which occasioned them to observe and mark the time of the Lord’s birth, and likewise the time of his passion, as we see Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c. have done: and in defending the truth of facts it is very usual, and indeed can hardly be avoided, to mention, among other circumstances, the time and place, &c., with some care, though not with the utmost exactness. So the Scripture notes our Lord was about thirty when he was baptized, and the like: now St. Irenæus must be supposed to have seen and read several of those discourses, and could not but be informed from them in some tolerable measure of the Lord’s age; nay, he would certainly have considered them in particular, the better to confute the heretics he wrote against, upon such an occasion; and not negligently have exposed himself to the scorn of his adversaries, who would doubtless have used all diligence to shew how grossly he argued, and how much he was mistaken, if he had set down things at random, and made a false computation.

4. St. Irenæus’ own words prove he was not guilty of so great an error as this spurious passage would fasten upon him. For in another place, where he is not so much concerned to be exact, he justly places the Lord’s birth<sup>a</sup> about the forty-first year of Augustus: now if Christ lived but forty years from thence, he could not be crucified in the reign of Tiberius, nor under Pontius Pilate; for Tiberius died thirty-seven years after the birth of Christ, and Pilate was removed from his government of Judæa at least a year before; for he was made governor in the twelfth of Tiberius<sup>r</sup>, and continued but ten years<sup>s</sup>; so that he was displaced one year before Tiberius died, and consequently in the thirty-sixth year from the birth of Christ; and certainly St. Irenæus, who was acquainted with times

<sup>p</sup> In Marcionem, lib. iv. cap. 7. [p. 417 C.] Testem fidelissimum dominicæ natiuitatis, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 25. Natus est enim Dominus noster circa primum et quadra-

gesimum annum Augusti imperii, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Euseb. Chronic. p. 202. [or p. 188. edit. Scaliger. fol. Lugd. Bat. 1606.]

<sup>s</sup> Joseph. Antiquitat. Judaic. lib. xviii. cap. 5.

more remote, could not but know this from Josephus, whom he had read.

It is not to be imagined, the time of acting that bloody tragedy on the Lord of life could be so soon and so much forgotten by his most zealous adorers, and those who professed to worship him as God<sup>t</sup>. Or, however, they must needs remember the precise time of so famous an event as the Destruction of Jerusalem; when every body knows it happened under Vespasian; and in Irenæus' days they could not but know it was in that emperor's second year; nay further, that it was on the first of September, and on the seventh day of the week too, as well as we do now; for St. Irenæus wrote but about one hundred years after it, and was an old man too when he wrote. Now from these things nothing was easier than to compute the time of the passion.

From the passion to the destruction of Jerusalem, it was generally allowed by the primitive Fathers, were about forty or forty-two years, as is plain from Eusebius<sup>u</sup>, Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>x</sup>, Origen<sup>y</sup>, &c. And Phlegon, who wrote a little before St. Irenæus was born, as he is cited by Origen<sup>z</sup>, says expressly, 'that about forty years 'from the fifteenth of Tiberius, (in which St. Luke says our Lord 'was baptized, being thirty years of age,) the city and temple of 'Jerusalem were destroyed.' St. Irenæus then cannot be supposed ignorant of this, no more than Mr. Wall can be thought not to know the time when the reformation began in England; or that it was under Henry VIII; or how long it is since that king's reign.

But if St. Irenæus knew our Lord's passion was about forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, he could not make Christ to have lived above thirty-one years, or thereabout. For it is plain from the best histories, and from the observations of eclipses, that Augustus died fourteen years after the birth of Christ; after which Tiberius reigned twenty-three years, and consequently died anno 37. Thence Caligula reigned about three years and a half, and therefore died anno 41. Claudius succeeded for about thirteen years and a half, and died anno 54. Nero reigned about fourteen years, and therefore died anno 68. Galba reigned about seven months, and therefore died about anno 69. Otho three months, and died likewise anno 69. Vitellius reigned but eight months, and died about

<sup>t</sup> Plin. lib. x. Epist. 103, 134. Et apud Euseb. Chronic. p. 209. [or p. 195. edit. 1606.]

<sup>u</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 7. Et Chronic. p. 206. [p. 192. edit. 1606.]

<sup>x</sup> Strom. lib. i. p. 340 B.

<sup>y</sup> Orig. adv. Celsum, lib. iv. p. 174. [Sect. xxii. in edit. Benedict.]

<sup>z</sup> Tractat. xxix. in Matth. p. 138, 139. [Op. tom. iii. p. 859. (sect. 40.) edit. Benedict.]

the beginning of 70. Vespasian succeeded him; in whose second year the city was destroyed; that is, about the year 71: but if our Lord suffered forty years before that, by subtracting forty from seventy-one, you have thirty-one, about which age he was crucified.

There may indeed be some variations in computing these periods; but it is impossible to find any ground, especially for those so near the times we speak of, to reckon Christ was near fifty when he died.

Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>a</sup> calculates very much after this manner, with but little difference. And to suppose St. Irenæus ignorant of these necessary steps, which were then so very easy to be known, viz. about sixty or at most seventy years after the events, is as absurd a supposition as can well be, and makes this Father a most negligent writer. Josephus alone, whom he had read, or Phlegon, who wrote but in Adrian's time, could have furnished him with particulars sufficient to judge of the Lord's age at his passion, as appears by the following series extracted from Josephus:

	Yrs.	m.	d.
Augustus <sup>b</sup> reigned .....	57	0	0
Tiberius <sup>c</sup> .....	20	5	3
Caligula <sup>d</sup> .....	3	8	0
Claudius <sup>e</sup> .....	13	8	30
Nero <sup>f</sup> ... ..	13	0	8
Galbas .....	0	7	7
Otho <sup>h</sup> .....	0	3	2
Vitellius <sup>i</sup> .....	0	8	5
And Titus <sup>k</sup> destroyed Jerusalem in the second year of his father Vespasian }	2	0	0
The total is .....	111	4	24

Now St. Irenæus, as I have before noted, places the birth of Christ in the forty-first of Augustus; therefore taking forty-one from one hundred and eleven, there will remain seventy for the time between the birth of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem; and then supposing this destruction, according to the common account, to have been about forty years after the passion, Christ must have suffered at near thirty years of age. Or, to give the matter shorter, the Scriptures assure us Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate; now he governed Judæa no longer than Tiberius

<sup>a</sup> Strom. lib. i. p. 339 B. &c. 340, seqq.

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. cap. 8.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. lib. xix. cap. 2.

<sup>e</sup> De Bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. 11.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. lib. v. cap. 6.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. <sup>h</sup> Ibid. cap. 8.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. cap. 13.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. lib. vii. cap. 18.



reigned, and not so long; and Tiberius, according to Josephus, reigned twenty years; to which if we add the fourteen years Christ lived under Augustus, they amount to no more than thirty-four years, if Christ had lived as long as Tiberius did. Or again, if Tiberius reigned but twenty years, and Christ was about thirty in Tiberius' fifteenth, as St. Luke assures us, then he could not be above four or five and thirty at most when he died: but as he died under Pilate, who was dismissed the government a year sooner, so Christ must have died a year younger. So that it was not possible for St. Irenæus, which way soever he went to work, to stretch the time of our Lord's life upon earth to near forty, much less fifty years, as the author of the latter part of the chapter, out of which the pædobaptists cite the words they build on, has inconsiderately done.

Mr. Dodwell, it is true, has endeavoured to make the opinion, of Christ's being toward fifty years old, the more excusable, and likely to have been St. Irenæus', by shewing, that he was nearer forty than is generally believed<sup>1</sup>: but if his calculation be ever so exact, it can signify nothing in the present case, because he agrees with us, that the time of the passion was the nineteenth of Tiberius, and only sets the time of his birth something backwarder than we do; which is not to be allowed in this case, because St. Irenæus himself has determined the time of his birth to the forty-first of Augustus; from which to the nineteenth of Tiberius is but thirty-three years, according to Mr. Dodwell himself.

From all this therefore I think it must necessarily follow, that St. Irenæus cannot be reasonably thought the author of this part of that chapter; for it cannot fairly be imagined that a man of his learning and integrity was either incapable of making the necessary computations, or so intolerably careless as to neglect them, especially when he was professedly treating the matter, and did not speak of it by the by.

2. But in the second place it is doubtful whether St. Irenæus said as our adversaries understand the passage now; because we have not his own words, but only a translation of them, which may give them a quite different face from what they had in the original: and therefore, if the words be allowed to have any weight at all, it can be but very little. And translators very often took a great latitude, as several among the ancients have complained.

But as to this translation of St. Irenæus in particular, it is a very scandalous one, and altogether unworthy the original. And this all

<sup>1</sup> Dissert. i. in Irenæum, sect. 46. p. 82, &c.

learned men confess, since it has been known to be a translation: the great Scaliger says, ‘the translator was an ass, and had even less learning than Ruffinus<sup>m</sup>:’ and yet one would think no man could abuse his original more than it is known Ruffinus was wont to do. Monsieur Du Pin calls it a barbarous version<sup>n</sup>: and a little after says, ‘the version of the five books concerning the heresies, ‘though barbarous—and full of faults,’ &c. And in a note he has added he says, ‘It was certainly composed by a man who understood neither language as he ought<sup>o</sup>;’ that is, neither the Greek in which St. Irenæus wrote, nor the Latin, into which he pretended to translate. The learned Mr. Dodwell calls it ‘a foolish translation<sup>p</sup>;’ and the author of it, ‘a barbarous, unskilful translator,’ who, he says, has several times ‘mistaken one word for another, so ‘as even to alter the sense very much from what the author ‘intended<sup>q</sup>:’ and he gives several instances of it.

Dr. Grabe, the learned editor of this Father, in the prolegomena he has prefixed to the late edition, reckons it but a bad translation; and says, they who fancy St. Irenæus to have been the translator as well as the author, ‘make that great man unacquainted with his ‘own thoughts, or else they must say he has expressed them very ‘awkwardly<sup>r</sup>.’

But besides the judgment of learned men, the badness of the version may be seen by comparing it with those fragments of the Greek which are still preserved.

In one place<sup>s</sup> where the original and the version disagree, Dr. Grabe thinks the copy the translator made use of was corrupt: which however could not well be so early as the doctor (without any ground) supposes the translation to be made, namely, in St. Irenæus’ time, or soon after. I should rather impute the variation to the translator’s ignorance or carelessness; especially since we have other undoubted instances how unequal he was to the work he undertook.

In another placet, the doctor thinks some words, which had been noted in the margin, are now crept into the text itself: and elsewhere he very frequently finds fault with the translation. In the twenty-fifth chapter of the third book, instead of *ποιήσατος τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅπερ ἐβ.*, the interpreter seems to have read, not without very

<sup>m</sup> Scaligerana, p. 213. L’interprète d’Irenée est bien asne, il est plus indocte encore que Ruffin.

<sup>n</sup> Hist. Eccles. p. 67, 68; [or, p. 60 of the second edition of the first volume, fol. 1693.]

<sup>o</sup> Page 71. letter K.

<sup>p</sup> Dissert. v. sect. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. sect. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 2. § 3.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 21. note a. p. 250.

<sup>t</sup> Ad lib. iii. cap. 19. note b. p. 245.

great negligence to be sure, *ποιήσαντας τοῦτο ὅπερ ἐβούλετο*; entirely perverting the author's sense, as the doctor has noted<sup>u</sup>.

Again, St. Irenæus had said, 'For since by a tree we lost it, (viz. the word of God,) by a tree we have received it again<sup>x</sup>;' [but the translator falsely renders it, *by a tree it was again made manifest unto all*,] 'shewing the height, and length, and breadth, and depth' [this last word is omitted in the translation] 'which is in it; for' [the translator turns it *and*, and adds, *as some of the ancients have said*] 'by a divine' [this word the translator omits] 'stretching out of the hands, he gathered two people under one head, even the Father;' [the translator renders it, *two people under one God*; and then adds, of his own, *two hands, because there were two people scattered to the ends of the earth; but one middle head*] 'for God is one, who is over all, and through all, and in all.' The translation is different in this last clause too: for it runs, 'for one God is over all, through all, and in us all.' In this one short passage, you see, there is abundance of liberty taken, and that several times the sense is changed.

In another place, to give but one instance more, the translator has altered the sense of the Greek very much. St. Irenæus reckons up the four covenants God had made with men in this manner: 'One after the flood of Noah, in the bow; the second, that of Abraham, in the sign of circumcision; the third, the giving of the law by Moses; and the fourth, that of the Gospel, by our Lord Jesus Christ<sup>y</sup>.' But the translator reckons them up thus: 'One with Adam before the flood; the second with Noah after the flood; the third, the giving of the Law under Moses; the fourth renews the man, and comprehends all in it, which is by the Gospel, giving men wings, and raising them up into the heavenly kingdom.' One would think this could not be pretended to be a translation of St. Irenæus' sense, it is so different from it. But you may see what strange work has been made with this book, and how much the translator, through ignorance, negligence, and too much liberty, has corrupted and abused this great man's work. And can any body, after all this, be satisfied barely from such a transaction, that he has, in any case, the true sense of St. Irenæus, without any alteration? And much less should any ground an argument upon it. It must appear therefore very doubtful, at least, whether St. Irenæus ever spoke as the present translation makes him do: for I have shewn, I think more than probably, that this part of the chapter could not be St. Irenæus'; and that if it was, yet we can have no

<sup>u</sup> Page 255. note b.

<sup>x</sup> Lib. v. cap. 17. p. 426.

<sup>y</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 11. p. 223.

reason to depend on the translator. And therefore Mr. Wall should have secured the passage from these exceptions, if he intended to do his cause any service with it: for if St. Irenæus did not write those words, or to that purpose exactly, whatever may be proved from them signifies nothing.

Nay, if Mr. Wall had proved beyond contradiction, that the Latin translation of the passage he cites does punctually agree with what was in the Greek original written by St. Irenæus himself; yet it would still have been liable to the following weighty exceptions, which effectually take off the force of the argument the pædobaptists raise from it: it depending entirely on these two suppositions, that by *regenerated* is meant *baptized*, and by *infants* such as we now call *infants in age*, and but *new-born*: for it is very plain, that if the passage does not speak of infants, or if it does not speak of baptizing them, it proves nothing.

1. In the first place then, there is no reason to think the word *regenerated* here means *baptized*. Mr. Wall indeed tells us<sup>z</sup>, that such as are at all acquainted with the books of those ages cannot doubt but the word *regeneration*, in the usual phrase of those times, signified *baptism*: but one would think by this assertion, that our author is not much acquainted with the books of those times himself; and that he had never read them, when he says, the ancient Christians ‘never use the word *regenerate* or *born again*, but that ‘they mean or denote by it *baptism*<sup>a</sup> ;’ for nothing can be more apparently false, as I shall shew.

But first, we must observe our author begins this matter something higher: and as he pretends to have found baptism practised by the Jews in and before Christ’s time; so he likewise tells us, they called that *baptism*, *regeneration*<sup>b</sup>; and from them Christ himself and all Christians borrowed not only the thing, but also that way of speaking of it.

But I have proved, as plainly as it can be expected such a thing should be proved, that the Jews had no such initiatory baptism; and consequently, they could not call it by that name. Or however, if it should be allowed they had such a baptism, I believe they nowhere call it *regeneration*, whatever Mr. Wall pretends. I am sure there is nothing like it in the passages he cites. Indeed, proselytes were thought new men, and the Talmud and Maimonides, as our author quotes them, say, ‘they were like children new-born:’ but the same is said of a slave that is made free too, even in the same words of Maimonides; and yet slaves were not made free by

<sup>z</sup> Part i. p. 18. [45.]

<sup>a</sup> Introd. p. 22. [20.]

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. p. 21. [19.]



this pretended initiatory baptism. So that though proselytes were accounted as children new-born, because they were now in a different state from what they were in before ; yet where is it said, or so much as intimated, that baptism was called or thought a regeneration? It does not follow, because they are said to be *as* new-born babes, that they were said likewise to *be* new-born ; nor, if they were said to be new-born, that they meant nothing but baptism by that new birth. Why should not circumcision, or offering sacrifice, be the regeneration, as well as baptism? Or indeed, why should we say, either of them were called regeneration, when the passage our author goes upon intimates no such thing?

And how trifling must it be from these fancies to go about to explain what the Scriptures mean by the *new birth*, and the *new creature*? Nay, if all the rabbins did assert what our author pretends to say from them ; is it becoming a Christian divine to forsake the Scriptures to follow the rabbins? By this new creation the Scriptures, it is plain, mean *the renewing of the mind*, Rom. xii. 2, and *the renewing of the Holy Ghost*, Tit. iii. 5. It is strange it should ever come into any one's head to give so perverse a turn to the words, *If any man be in Christ he is a new creature* ; as to say, they mean *he is baptized* : but surely nobody will think St. Paul could talk at this poor rate. It is more natural to understand them, as he perhaps more plainly runs the same argument, Coloss. iii. 9, 10, to intend, that such as were in Christ, and risen with him, (verse 1,) were become new creatures, by *putting off the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him*. And beside this, the Scriptures know of no other regeneration that we are here capable of.

Though this is undoubtedly the true Scripture notion of regeneration, as appears from the places where the word *regenerate*, &c., is used, or regeneration spoken of ; yet Mr. Wall is pleased to call it, with some seeming contempt, the 'modern notion,' and he appropriates it to 'some late English writers : ' and the reason is plain ; for if it should once come to be thought as ancient as the Scriptures and earliest writings, it might go very near to spoil the best argument for paedobaptism our adversaries can find in all antiquity, which is this of St. Irenæus. But however they may dread the consequences, it is certain regeneration meant this spiritual birth, and nothing short of a real personal change.

Of all the passages in Scripture where *regenerate*, &c., is used, I do not remember any are disputed but these two, viz. the words of our Lord, John iii. 5, and those of St. Paul, Tit. iii. 5. And these

indeed are by our author cited as instances to confirm his sense: but what ground he has, beside a strong imagination, I do not see. The words of our Saviour are a little obscure, since the prevailing of infant-baptism; for baptism being never administered but to persons supposed to be regenerated, of which it was the sign, &c., therefore all that were baptized were spoken of as regenerated; and then infants being baptized, they must be taken to be regenerated too, and so baptism and regeneration come to be taken, by some people, for the same thing. And indeed, upon this notion it was pretty easy to mistake our Saviour's words: but this mistake may be as easily seen; for our Lord does not say, *born of water alone*, but *born of water and the Spirit*. He does not speak of two new births, one by water and one by the Spirit; but only of one, which was to be of water and the Spirit in conjunction. And thus then, without going any farther, it appears, that though we may charitably hope, and say, all who are regularly baptized are regenerated, yet the baptizing in water is not the regenerating; because that other part, viz. of the Spirit, is at least equally required to regeneration: and therefore baptism with water is not regeneration.

But we may ask further, whether the new birth Christ speaks of does peculiarly consist in the external administration by water only, or in the internal operations of the Spirit only, or in both together? Now that both water and the Spirit are necessary in the case our Lord is speaking of, is plain from the words themselves: and that the regeneration really consists but in one, and the other is only used as a means, or the like, is, I think, full as plain.

For, as to the external administration of baptism by water; it is ever in the Scriptures spoken of as a symbol only, and representation of something else of a more excellent nature. This is so evident to all who read the Scriptures, that I need not go about to prove it: *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death*. And the very name of sacrament, even according to the notion given of it in the Articles of the Church of England, imports as much<sup>d</sup>.

Now if to this it be added, that baptism is nowhere called regeneration, but that the internal change of the mind, &c., frequently is: that baptism is not obtained by means of the Spirit; but on the contrary, the Spirit was wont to be obtained in the use of baptism: methinks it should be plain enough, that the regeneration our Lord spoke of was spiritual, to be signified and obtained, or the like, by the symbol of baptism in water.

But besides, our Lord's own words put the matter out of doubt:

<sup>c</sup> [Romans vi. 4.]

<sup>d</sup> Article xxv.

for continuing his discourse on the same new birth, he appropriates it wholly to the Spirit, and speaks only of being born of the Spirit; for it is that only he opposes to the former fleshly birth, in the words next immediately following, ver. 6, which shews that was the only birth he meant before; for how incoherent would he else have been! When he had told Nicodemus of a certain new birth, which puzzled his understanding, to run from that, and talk of quite another thing, could not but have made him more confused; whereas Christ goes about to take off the amazement, *Marvel not*, says he, *that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again*, ver. 7, and shews him, it is no wonder if he does not understand how it can be, since even in natural causes, the wind for instance, he is forced to confess his ignorance. And this makes it evident, that Christ speaks of spiritual regeneration, and no other: for had he by *born again* meant baptism, that could not have been so hard to be understood, nor have given our Saviour occasion to say, *Marvel not*, &c. And especially, if it had been the practice of the Jews to baptize their proselytes, and call that baptism regeneration, as it is pretended; how is it possible Nicodemus should not understand a common phrase of his mother tongue? Christ indeed wonders, that he, being a ruler of Israel, should not better apprehend what was said: but our adversaries are quite mistaken, when they think the Lord wonders why Nicodemus did not understand the regeneration he spake of; for Christ endeavours to convince him, that this was indeed above his conception: and it is after this that Nicodemus says, *How can these things be?* and that the Lord answers, *Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?* To *know* here does not mean to *comprehend*, or understand the nature of the thing; but *to be convinced*, and *to believe*, as the same thing is expressed, ver. 12, *I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not*. So that our Lord wonders that Nicodemus, being a teacher in Israel, should not know and believe, notwithstanding the prophets had so plainly taught it, that there was an internal renovation of the mind, which all persons, as well the Jews themselves as the heathens, stood in need of, and were to receive especially under the dispensation of the Messias.

Very remarkable here are the words of the incomparable Grotius: 'Christ discovers a new thing to Nicodemus: that now something greater than Judaism was required of all that should be saved<sup>c</sup>.' And doubtless our Lord taught him here the same doctrine which St. Paul taught afterwards, Gal. vi. 15, that *in Christ Jesus neither*

<sup>c</sup> In Johan. iii. 3. Rem novam Nicodemo legis doctori Christus indicat, posthac ad salutem pariendam majus aliquid Judaismo requiri.

*circumcision availeth any thing, &c., but a new creature:* for Grotius justly reckons these passages are parallel. And this clearly seems to have been the common stumblingblock which Nicodemus could not surmount, viz. That the law should be counted so imperfect and insufficient. What has been said, I hope, proves our Saviour, John iii. 5, means only being born of the Spirit, by or in the use of baptism with water, as the external symbol and seal of such regeneration.

The other passage, Tit. iii. 5, has no manner of difficulty in it: nor can I guess what could incline any man to cite it as an instance, that regeneration means baptism, when it evidently means the contrary. By *the washing of regeneration*, I allow, is meant baptism; that is, by the whole phrase: but to say by *regeneration* is meant baptism too, is absurd and groundless enough. On another occasion<sup>f</sup>, our author cites this very place, and argues that λουτρὸν, *the washing*, signifies baptism; and makes λουτρὸν and βαπτισμός synonymous terms: for, λελουμένοι, he says, means *baptized*; and thence he infers, because λουτρὸν signifies any kind of washing, therefore baptism may be administered by any kind of washing. But here he will have the word *regeneration* mean baptism, because this is most for his purpose now: so that take our author altogether, and both words mean baptism; and then the place may be rendered, *the baptism of baptism* instead of *the washing of regeneration*.

Which of the two words would any man think more particularly and properly here signified baptism? That which does express some washing, or that which has no such sense? Every one would pitch on λουτρὸν, *the washing*, rather than *regeneration*; for λουτρὸν is made the *genus*, to signify washing or baptism in general, and *regeneration* is added as the *difference* to distinguish it from all other washings, and limit the assertion to signify, that God saves us by the *Christian* baptism only, or that washing which is *the washing of regeneration, and of the renewing of the Holy Ghost*.

But we may see our author has offered a great violence to the words, if we observe the use of the phrase here occurring; for thus we meet with *the baptism of repentance* several times in the Scripture, to signify that baptism which follows upon, is accompanied with, and is a sign of repentance, as Mark i. 4; Acts xiii. 24, and xix. 4. And thus St. Justin, probably alluding to this place in Titus, uses διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ τῆς μετανοίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, to signify the washing or 'baptism of repentance, and the knowledge

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. p. 221. [537.]

§ Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 231 B. C. [sect. xiv. edit. Benedict.]



‘ of God ;’ and therefore διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, exactly the same form of speech, means, by the washing or *baptism of regeneration, and of the renewing of the Holy Ghost*. And as nobody can be so wild as to imagine, that because St. Justin says, *the washing of repentance*, therefore repentance signifies baptism ; so in like manner, it is as absurd to say, that when St. Paul speaks of *the washing of regeneration*, regeneration means baptism ; for the case is as exactly parallel as can be wished.

I would add one remark more, viz. that St. Paul calls this *the washing* (not only of regeneration, but also) of the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Every one, who understands the Greek tongue, must needs confess this is the right construction of the place : and it is thus the Ethiopic translator has rendered it ; and the Arabic too, notwithstanding the author of the Latin translation of the Arabic published in Dr. Walton's Polyglot gives it a different but a wrong turn, which the Arabic will not admit : for the *inseparable* preposition here, as in the Ethiopic, translated *by*, is joined only to *washing* ; and all the rest is, as the grammarians style it, *in statu constructo*, and therefore ought to be rendered, as he that added the Latin translation to the Ethiopic has likewise done, by *the washing of regeneration, and of the renovation of the Holy Ghost*. And then if washing refers to *the renovation of the Holy Ghost*, as well as to *regeneration*, it must follow, that *the renewing of the Holy Ghost* means baptism as much as regeneration does : that is, not at all : for as the inference will be allowed to be manifestly absurd in one case, so it is in the other. And therefore I now draw this general conclusion, in opposition to our author, that the Scriptures never call baptism *regeneration*.

As to his other pretence, ‘ that regeneration, in the usual phrase ‘ of that time, (viz. in which St. Irenæus lived,) signifies baptism<sup>h</sup> ;’ and that the ancients ‘ never use the word *regenerate* or *born again*, ‘ but that they mean or denote by it baptism<sup>i</sup> :’ it is, I think, one of the most groundless assertions I ever met with ; for, on the contrary, nothing is more common than to take this word in a quite different sense ; and I do not believe it is ever so much as once used in the ancientest times for baptism : at least not till their zeal for infant-baptism betrayed them into that absurdity, which was not near the time of St. Irenæus.

I have shewn you how St. Justin uses the word *regeneration*, and that he cannot be understood to mean *baptism* by it : and it is very

<sup>h</sup> Part i. p. 18. [45.]

<sup>i</sup> Introd. p. 22. [20.]

easy to prove as much of the other Fathers. Clemens Alexandrinus relates from Alexander Polyhistor, that the Indian Brachmans eat no living creatures, nor drink any wine; that some of them eat every day as we do, and others only every third day: and he adds, that ‘they do not fear death, nor esteem life, because they reckon ‘death is but another birth<sup>k</sup>’ (παλιγγενεσίαν). Origen uses it to mean the resurrection; when speaking of the apostles he says, ‘In ‘the regeneration (παλιγγενεσία) they shall sit upon twelve ‘thrones.’ And again, on the same occasion, he says, ‘Those ‘who followed our Saviour shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging ‘the twelve tribes of Israel: and this power they shall receive ‘in the resurrection of the dead. For this is the *regeneration*, it ‘being a kind of new generation<sup>m</sup>,’ &c. And this mode of speech is borrowed from the Scriptures themselves, Matt. xix. 28, and was used also by the Jews, as Grotius has shewn from Josephus and Philon.

But to come nearer the case in hand: Tertullian undoubtedly speaks of something internal, when he says, alluding to the Decalogue, that ‘we are born in the same number of months, as we are ‘regenerated by precepts<sup>o</sup>.’ Clemens Alexandrinus relating how St. John restored to the church that young man, who, after he had been educated in the Christian religion, and baptized, became a captain of a band of robbers, and commending his great repentance, says, he gave ‘a great example of true repentance, and an extraordinary instance of regeneration<sup>p</sup>;’ that is, of conversion; for nothing can be here understood by regeneration but an internal change of mind. In another passage the same St. Clement says, ‘The Father of all things receives those that fly to him; and having *regenerated* them (ἀναγεννήσας) in the Spirit, to the adoption ‘of sons, he knows them to be of a good disposition; and them only ‘he loves, and helps and defends; and for this cause he calls them ‘children<sup>q</sup>.’ Here ἀναγεννήσας Πνεύματι, I hope, cannot be thought

<sup>k</sup> Stromat. lib. iii. p. 451 B. Καταφρονούσι δὲ θανάτου καὶ παρ’ οὐδὲν ἡγούνται τὸ ζῆν· πείθονται γὰρ εἶναι παλιγγενεσίαν. [Dr. Wall has noticed, in his ‘Defence,’ the singular translation which Mr. Gale gives of these words.]

<sup>l</sup> In Matth. p. 354 E. Οἱ καὶ καθεδούνται οἱ ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ἐπὶ ἰβ’ θρόνους. [Comm. tom. xiv. sect. 15. ed. Bened.]

<sup>m</sup> Comment. in Matth. p. 391 C. Οἱ τοίνυν ἀκολουθήσαντες τῷ Σωτῆρι καθεδούνται ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, κρίνοντας τὰς ἰβ’ φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ταύτην λήψονται τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν· αὕτη γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ παλιγγενεσία καὶ νῦν τις

γένεσις οὖσα. [Comm. tom. xv. sect. 22.]

<sup>n</sup> Not. in Matth. xix. 28.

<sup>o</sup> De Anima, p. 292 C. Ut tanto temporis numero nascamur, quanto discipline numero renascimur. [cap. 37.]

<sup>p</sup> Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 23. Διδούς μέγα παράδειγμα μετανοίας ἀληθινῆς, καὶ μέγα γνώρισμα παλιγγενεσίας, &c.

<sup>q</sup> Pædagog. lib. i. p. 90 B. Οὕτω καὶ τῶν ὕλων ὁ Πατὴρ τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν καταπεφυγότας προσίεται· καὶ ἀναγεννήσας Πνεύματι εἰς νιοθεσίαν, ἡπίους οἶδεν· καὶ φιλεῖ τούτους μόνους, καὶ βοηθεῖ, καὶ ὑπερμαχεῖ· καὶ διὰ τούτου [sic] ὀνομάζει παιδίον.

to mean baptized, especially since it is said, that those who are so regenerated are ἡπιοι. Those words also of this Father are very remarkable to this purpose, where he says, 'To instruct and 'enlighten the understanding, is called also by the heathen philosophers (ἀναγεννήσαι) to regenerate.'

The particle *also* in this period plainly imports, that the same way of speaking was in use among the Christians too: but the following words make it more evident, where he cites St. Paul as meaning the same thing, when he says, 1 Cor. iv. 15, *For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel.* To which he might also have added, Gal. iv. 19, *My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you:* which plainly shews the Christian birth consists in Christ's being formed in them. And St. Clement is so far from leaving any room to imagine baptism was called *regeneration*, that he expressly says it is 'the sign of regeneration<sup>s</sup>;' and sure it cannot be the sign, and the thing signified too. And afterwards he calls regeneration 'a new spiritual generation<sup>t</sup>.' The whole passage is too long to be transcribed; but I will give you another which is much shorter, and very express: 'An adulteress 'lives indeed to sin, but she is dead to the commands; but she that 'repents, being as it were regenerated (ἀναγεννηθεῖσα) by a change of 'manners, has the regeneration (παλιγγενεσίαν) of life: she is dead 'to the former adulteries, and is entered again into life, being re-generated (γεννηθείσης) by repentance<sup>u</sup>.' Nay, it may be yet farther observed, that instead of calling baptism *generation* or *regeneration*, he directly on the contrary calls it 'death, and the end 'of the old life<sup>x</sup>.'

In the same manner likewise Origen talks of regeneration; in one passage particularly he is very plain: and because his words, I think, unravel the whole difficulty, and may lead into the reason of other more obscure places, I will transcribe the passage at large. 'The washing with water is a symbol of a pure mind, cleansed from 'all filthiness of evil: and to one who gives himself up to God, it is 'in itself, by the power of the invocation of the adorable Trinity, 'the beginning and fountain of Divine gifts.—This the history of

<sup>r</sup> Stromat. lib. v. p. 552 C. Ἐπεὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάροις φιλοσόφοις, τὸ κατηχή-  
σαι τε καὶ φωτίσαι ἀναγεννήσαι λέγεται.

<sup>s</sup> Eclog. p. 801. col. 2 D.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. p. 802. col. 1 B.

<sup>u</sup> Stromat. lib. ii. p. 425 A. Ἡ γὰρ τοι  
πορνεύσασα ζῇ μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀπέθανεν δὲ  
ταῖς ἐντολαῖς. ἡ δὲ μετανόησασα, οὖον ἀνα-  
γεννηθεῖσα κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τοῦ βίου,

παλιγγενεσίαν ἔχει ζωῆς. τεθνηκυίας μὲν  
τῆς πόρνης τῆς παλαιᾶς, εἰς βίον δὲ παρελ-  
θούσης αὐτῆς τῆς κατὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν γεννη-  
θείσης. [See Dr. Wall's remark upon the  
incorrect translation of this passage, in  
his 'Defence.']

<sup>x</sup> Eclog. p. 800 a. C. Θάνατος καὶ τέλος  
λέγεται τοῦ παλαιοῦ βίου τὸ βάπτισμα.

‘ the Acts of the Apostles greatly confirms ; since it is related, that  
 ‘ the Spirit did then evidently come upon those who were baptized,  
 ‘ the water preparing the way for him, in such as came to it as they  
 ‘ ought, insomuch that Simon the magician, amazed at the sight,  
 ‘ would have obtained of Peter the same grace, and desired to  
 ‘ purchase the most righteous thing with the mammon of unright-  
 ‘ eousness. And it is farther to be observed, that the baptism of  
 ‘ John was inferior to the baptism of Jesus, given by his disciples :  
 ‘ those therefore who in the Acts were baptized with the baptism of  
 ‘ John, and had not heard whether there were any Holy Ghost,  
 ‘ were baptized again by the apostle. For the baptism of regenera-  
 ‘ tion was not given by John, but by Jesus, by the hands of his  
 ‘ disciples ; and it is called the laver of regeneration, the perform-  
 ‘ ance of it being accompanied with the renewing of the Spirit,  
 ‘ which being from God, is now also preferred above the water, but  
 ‘ is not always ingenerated together with the watery.’

St. Clemens Romanus can mean nothing but internal regeneration and conversion, when he says, ‘ Noah being found faithful, preached  
 ‘ regeneration (παλιγγενεσίαν) to the worldz.’ And it is strange  
 what could be in Junius’ mind to urge that by regeneration was to  
 be understood in this place the resurrection : for Noah was indeed a  
 preacher of repentance, but we do not find his main business was to  
 preach the resurrection ; nor is St. Clement here speaking of the  
 resurrection. To these I will only add a passage of St. Barnabas,  
 which is very remarkable ; ‘ Since therefore he has renewed us by  
 ‘ the remission of our sins, he has given us another form, that we  
 ‘ should have our souls like the soul of a child ; even as he himself  
 ‘ has formed us<sup>a</sup>.’ Most directly shewing, that the Christian new  
 formation or regeneration is by the Spirit.

And now could any body, sir, that had read these passages, fairly  
 pretend the ancients by *regeneration* always mean *baptism*? If Mr.  
 Wall had not read these books, he ought not so readily to have  
 made the assertion : and if he has read them, what excuse can be  
 framed for him ? For it is apparent from these instances, to which  
 many more might have been added, that the most ancient Fathers  
 by *regeneration* mean something spiritual and internal, and very dif-  
 ferent from *baptism*. And the same might be very easily proved too,

<sup>y</sup> In Johan. p. 124, 125. [Comm. tom. vi. sect. 17. ed. Benedict. The original words of the last clause are these ; Πνεύματος τοῦ καὶ νῦν ἐπιφερομένου, ἐπειδὴ περὶ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ’ οὐ πᾶσι μετὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐγγινομένου.]

<sup>z</sup> Epist. 1. ad Corinth. cap. 9. Νῶε

πιστὸς εὗρεθεις, διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξε, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Epist. cap. vi. p. 18. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνακαίνισας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἄλλον τύπον, ὥς παιδίον ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς ἂν καὶ ἀναπλασσομένης αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς.



from his admired St. Austin himself, but it is needless. Instead of it we will examine the other position he lays down, to prove that *re-generated*, in the words he cites from St. Irenæus, means *baptized*, and this will quickly be found to be as groundless as the other.

He says, ‘Irenæus has used this word so in all other places of his book, that he has ever observed<sup>b</sup>.’ But if our author has not observed the several passages where it is used otherwise, I cannot help it: however, the argument depends not so much upon his observation, as upon the truth of the thing itself. But if he had pleased, one would think he might have observed, that St. Irenæus nowhere uses the word so, (at least, I am most inclined to think so,) because the instance he cites is so far from proving what he produces it for, that it well enough proves the direct contrary: and therefore I am surprised that the learned Dr. Grabe should refer to it also with the same design as our author. For to go no farther than the words Mr. Wall has transcribed, there is not the least reason to say St. Irenæus means baptism by regeneration. ‘When he gave his disciples the commission of regenerating unto God, he said unto them, *Go and teach*,’ &c. But why must we conclude from these words that St. Irenæus means by regenerating, *baptizing*? Is it not as good sense, and very agreeable with our Saviour’s design in the commission, by *regenerating* to understand *teaching, instructing, enlightening the mind, and converting* the nations to God? This doubtless was their chief business, though they were likewise to baptize all they had so converted. And therefore it is very arbitrary to restrain the word *regenerate* from signifying what was the main design of the commission, and to limit it, even contrary to its proper signification and general use, only to the less principal.

But the next words of Irenæus make it appear more clearly, that he meant an internal regeneration by the Spirit. ‘For God promised to pour him out upon his servants and handmaids in the latter days, that they might prophesy; wherefore he descended upon the Son of God, when he became the Son of man, accustoming himself in him to dwell with mankind, and to rest in men, and to dwell in the creature of God, working in them the will of the Father, and of old making them new in Christ<sup>c</sup>.’ It is plain from hence that the regeneration or renewing St. Irenæus speaks of

<sup>b</sup> Part i. p. 19. [45.]

<sup>c</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 19. p. 243 b. Hunc enim promissit per prophetas effundere in novissimis temporibus super servos et ancillas, ut prophetent: unde et in Filium Dei, Filium hominis factum, descendit,

cum ipso assuescens habitare in genere humano, et requiescere in hominibus, et habitare in plasmate Dei, voluntatem Patris operans in ipsis, et renovans eos a vetustate in novitatem Christi.

is to be wrought by the Spirit's indwelling. And a little after, speaking of our becoming one in Christ, he says, 'Our bodies receive that unity which is to immortality, by the laver; but our souls by the Spirit<sup>d</sup>:' shewing again, that he argues here chiefly upon that which is spiritual, and sufficiently implying, the regeneration he had before spoken of was such. The other passage which Dr. Grabe refers to<sup>e</sup> is, I think, likewise directly to the contrary sense; the words are these: 'Because this kind are subjected to Satan, to the denying of the baptism of regeneration to God, and the destruction of the whole faith<sup>f</sup>, &c. Now even here he does not say 'that baptism which is regeneration,' no more than the phrase, 'the baptism of repentance,' means 'the baptism which is repentance:' and if it will not follow from this phrase that repentance means baptism, then it will not follow in the other that regeneration means baptism. But it will be yet more clear that regeneration does not mean baptism, by what Irenæus adds; 'But they say it (viz. what they called redemption) is necessary, &c., that they may be regenerated unto that power which is above allg.' Now this being said of those who deny baptism, the word *regenerated* cannot mean *baptized*: and a little after again it is said, 'Baptism indeed was of Jesus for the remission of sins, but the redemption is of Christ that came upon him to perfection<sup>h</sup>;' which sufficiently distinguishes baptism from redemption, which 'is necessary that they may be regenerated,' for it is opposed to it.

St. Irenæus does not very often use the word *regenerate*; but where he does, I am pretty well assured it never means *baptize*: and though it is not impossible but I may have passed by some passage, or mistaken the sense somewhere, yet I have taken so much care, that I think I may very well venture to assert, there is not one place in all Irenæus' books, in which it plainly means baptism, or may not at least full as well mean something else; and that there are instances in which it cannot mean baptism, is beyond dispute. In one place he says, 'How shall they leave the generation of death, if they do not receive the regeneration which is by faith, believing in the new generation given by God in that wonderful unexpected

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. p. 244 a. Corpora enim nostra per lavacrum illam, quæ est ad incorruptionem, unitatem acceperunt; animæ autem per Spiritum.

<sup>e</sup> In Irenæum, lib. ii. cap. 39. p. 161. not. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. i. cap. 18. p. 88. Καὶ ὅτι μὲν εἰς ἐξάρτησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπό-

θεσιν ὑποβέβληται τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι—ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμιν ὦσιν ἀναγεγεννημένοι.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 89. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ βάπτισμα τοῦ φαινομένου Ἰησοῦ, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν δὲ ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ Χριστοῦ κατελήθοντος εἰς τελείωσιν.

'manner in sign of salvation, which was of the virgin by faith<sup>i</sup>?' The regeneration *by faith* here is elsewhere<sup>k</sup> said to be *by the laver*. Now as regeneration is different from the faith *by which* it is in one place; so it is also different from the laver or baptism *by which* it is in the other. But I need add no more, to shew you how much our author is out in saying St. Irenæus has used *regenerate* for *baptize* in all other places of his book; since he uses it so in no part of his writings, and sometimes so as plainly not to mean baptism; and therefore it is not true that it always means baptism in this book; unless Mr. Wall means in the second book particularly, out of which the citation is taken, and then indeed his assertion cannot be denied; for the word is used in no other place of that book at all.

Since then the Scriptures, the primitive Fathers, and among the rest St. Irenæus himself, by regeneration never mean baptism, it is highly unreasonable to pretend it means so in this single place; or if there should be some instances where it does sometimes signify baptism, there are many more, or at least some, where it plainly signifies quite another thing: and therefore, why must it needs mean baptism in this passage? If it does not mean baptism always, then perhaps it may not in this place neither.

One reason Mr. Wall gives for saying it must mean baptism in this place is, that here is express mention of infants who 'are not capable of regeneration in any other sense of the word, than as it signifies baptism<sup>l</sup>.' But this is only begging the question. Besides, Mr. Wall contradicts it himself, when he goes about to shew that infants may be regenerated of the Spirit, according to our Lord's rule, as well as of water; and tells us, 'that God by his Spirit does, at the time of baptism, seal and apply to the infant that is there dedicated to him, the promises of the covenant of which he is capable, viz. adoption, pardon of sin, translation from the state of nature to that of grace, &c., on which account the infant is said to be regenerated of (or by) the Spirit<sup>m</sup>.' There is another regeneration then besides baptism, mentioned by our Lord himself, of which our

<sup>i</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 59. p. 358 a. Quomodo autem relinquet mortis generationem, si non in novam generationem mire et inopinate a Deo, in signum autem salutis, datam, quæ est ex virgine per fidem, [credens eam recipiat quæ est per fidem] regenerationem? [The words enclosed within brackets do not occur in the text. Dr. Grabe conjectured that something to that purport had been lost from the context: 'Hic unum atque alterum verbum excidit, ac Irenæus ita forte scripsit:']

but the Benedictine editor (see his edition, fol. Paris, 1720. lib. iv. cap. 33. sect. 4.) considers Grabe to have been completely mistaken, and the sentence to be entire. See Dr. Wall's remarks on the passage in his 'Defence.'

<sup>k</sup> Lib. v. cap. 15. p. 423 b. Eam quæ est per lavacrum regenerationem, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Part i. p. 20. [49.]

<sup>m</sup> Part i. p. 148. [175] and part ii. p. 126. [448.]



author tells us infants are capable; and why might not this be the regeneration meant by St. Irenæus without baptism? And how came Mr. Wall to be so overseen as to say there is no other regeneration of which they are capable?

2. But this passage of St. Irenæus, though it had been genuine and well translated, would have been liable to a second exception, viz. that the word *infantes* does not necessarily signify here such newborn or young children as are not capable of reason; but may very well mean only such as can know and believe, and make a profession of their faith. I will not go about to prove that this word and several others of much the same sense, are often applied to grown and even to aged persons, to express their being but young or weak in Christianity, which Mr. Wall and every body allows; because the chapter, as it now stands, speaks of their natural not their Christian age: but however it will not follow that *infantes* means only such children as are wholly incapable of knowing and believing the necessary principles of the Christian religion, which is the supposition of our adversaries; for the term *infant* is of a larger extent.

Indeed if it meant only a sucking child, or one of two or three months or years, or the like, our author might have something to plead; but if it means all persons till twenty-one years of age, as in our English law, he could form no argument from it, though it were said infants were to be baptized. The whole business between us is reduced therefore to this, namely, to determine the period of infancy; and what must be meant by the word in the passage under consideration.

If it be urged that St. Irenæus says Christ sanctified (*omnem ætatem*) every several age, as Mr. Wall renders it; and consequently that he means the youngest infants too, who must be comprehended in so large an expression: it may be noted that St. Cyprian uses the same phrase, yet so as infants cannot be comprehended, when he says, ‘The word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came to all; and gathering both the learned and unlearned, he gave the precepts of salvation to both sexes, and (*omni ætati*) to every several age<sup>n</sup>.’ So when the author of the Recognitions says, ‘Therefore let (*omnis ætas*) every several age, both sexes, and all conditions hasten to repentance<sup>o</sup>,’ &c. undoubtedly he did not mean such infants too, as were not capable of repentance. I will add one instance more, in the words of Dionysius the great bishop of Alexandria<sup>p</sup>, who in a letter

<sup>n</sup> De Orat. Domin. p. 107. Nam cum Dei sermo Dominus noster Jesus Christus omnibus venerit, et colligens doctos, pariter et indoctos, omni sexui atque ætati præcepta salutis ediderit, &c. [p. 151. edit. Fell.]

<sup>o</sup> Lib. x. cap. 45. Itaque festinet ad poenitentiam omnis ætas, omnis sexus, omnisque conditio, &c.

<sup>p</sup> Euseb. Præfat. in lib. vii. Hist. Eccles.



to Dometius and Didymus says thus; 'It is needless to mention the names of the many martyrs among us who were unknown to you; but know this, that men and women, young men and old men, young women and old women, soldiers and private persons, all sorts, and (πᾶσα ἡλικία) all ages, some gaining the victory by scourges and fire, and others by the sword, have obtained their crowns<sup>q</sup>.' Now as it is incontestable that this phrase cannot include the youngest infants in these instances, so it need not be extended to such in the words of St. Irenæus.

Nor does the enumeration of the several ages make it necessary to understand such infants by the word: we must consider how far each of those ages extends, at what period they begin, and at what they conclude. Now that infancy was not confined to the narrow limits in which we commonly use the word, is, I think, past doubt. Origen has a remarkable passage to this effect: though he does not make use of this particular word, yet the words he does use are equally expressive of the tenderest age. 'Those,' says he, 'who from their childhood and first age are called to do the works of the kingdom of God,' &c. And St. Irenæus himself in his Epistle to Florinus uses πρώτη ἡλικία, though it be properly enough said even of new-born infants, in so large a sense as to reach that age, in which he could hear and understand the teachings of St. Polycarp, so as to remember them perfectly well in his old age: from whence it appears that the *first* of those ages, into which they divided man's life, was not shut up in very narrow bounds.

Feuardentius has noted from Philo, that Hippocrates limits infancy to seven years; but Danet, from the Greek and Latin writers, extends it to fourteen<sup>r</sup>: and this seems to be nearest St. Irenæus' mind, and may be collected from his own words. *Juvenes* extends to between thirty and forty. *Seniores* between forty and fifty, in the latter part of this very chapter, from whence the pædobaptists argue. And as he has thus assigned ten years to each of the last two stages, nothing can be more probable than that the first three were of the same length: upon this computation therefore infancy will reach to ten years of age; *parenti* will include all from thence to twenty, and *pueri* from twenty to thirty. This is the more con-

<sup>q</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 11. s. 18. Τοὺς δὲ ἡμετέρους πολλοὺς τε ὄντας καὶ ἀγνώτας ὑμῖν, περισσὸν ὀνομαστὶ καταλέγειν· πλὴν ἵστε ὅτι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ νέοι καὶ γέροντες, καὶ κόραι καὶ πρεσβύτες, καὶ στρατιῶται καὶ ἰδιῶται, καὶ πᾶν γένος καὶ πᾶσα ἡλικία, οἱ μὲν διὰ μαστίγων

καὶ πυρὸς, οἱ δὲ διὰ σιδήρου τὸν ἀγῶνα νικῆσαντες, τοὺς στεφάνους ἀπειλήφασιν.

<sup>r</sup> In Matth. p. 406 C. Τοὺς μὲν ἐκ παίδων, καὶ πρώτης ἡλικίας κληθέντας ἐπὶ τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργα, &c. [Comm. tom. xvi. sect. 36.]

<sup>s</sup> Diction. Antiq. Rom. et Græc. p. 51.

firmed, because it agrees with St. Irenæus' saying, he saw Florinus when he was *puer* (παῖς) ; for, as the time is laboriously calculated by the accurate Mr. Dodwell, he was then about twenty-five, which falls in very well with that computation which makes the limits of the age St. Irenæus calls *pueros*, to be from twenty to thirty. Mr. Dodwell, who is of the same opinion in this case, very learnedly illustrates the matter, and after him, I must not attempt it ; and therefore I refer you to his learned dissertations<sup>t</sup>.

If then *infantes*, in the language of St. Irenæus, means not only such as we now commonly call infants, of a few months, but also any under ten years of age ; what advantage can the pædobaptists gain by citing this passage ? They should prove the youngest infants, who have not the least use of reason, are to be baptized : whereas this place of St. Irenæus at most proves only that persons may be baptized under ten years of age. Now we only insist that persons cannot be baptized till they actually know, or at least profess to know and believe the first principles of the Christian religion : they who make such a profession, though ever so young, ought to be baptized. And when the pædobaptists pretend to oppose us, by citing passages in which the words have a larger acceptation than they commonly have at present, it is all trifling, and can make nothing to the purpose, unless the words were taken in the same limited sense in the passage cited, as they are in the question.

As soon as persons are capable of being taught what the apostles required of those they baptized, so soon they may be made fit for and received to baptism ; for there is no other set time when they must be received but this, viz. when they believe. And that children under ten are capable of this, none can doubt who understand any thing of the power of education. Common experience shews us how far that age can go in many things, especially if improved by a good education. If you know any of Mr. Locke's acquaintance, they will tell you many strange truths of the effects of his method on several who have had the happiness to be brought up in it. And pray, why should not that age be thought as capable of the plain easy principles of Christianity as of any thing else ? St. Austin<sup>u</sup> himself allows, as our author notes<sup>x</sup>, that at seven years children might be able to make the necessary responses. And I have known some admitted at about fourteen, and heard of some much younger ; and it is only for want of due care that there are not many more such instances : so that at most all that can be said from this passage

<sup>t</sup> In Irenæum, Dissertat. iii. § 6, &c.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. i. de Anima, cap. 10.

<sup>x</sup> Part i. p. 188, [212] and 288, [304.]

amounts but to this; That some infants, that is, some under ten years of age, may be admitted to baptism; which makes nothing against our opinion, for such also may believe. But if it be considered, 1. How doubtful it is whether the passage be genuine; 2. Whether it be well translated; 3. Whether it speaks of baptizing; and lastly, that it is plain it does not necessarily speak of infants so young: it must be allowed that this famous citation, after all the noise it has made, cannot be sufficient for any reasonable man to lay a stress upon it. And yet this is by far the most considerable our adversaries can produce so early. I have now made it appear, that for two hundred years after Christ, nothing can be argued with any force for pædobaptism; for St. Irenæus lived to about anno 190. And the next author Mr. Wall argues from is Tertullian, who did not write till about the beginning of the third century. What he says shall be referred to the following letter.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

### LETTER XIII.

AN argument against infant-baptism, drawn from Polycrates' letter to Victor—Tertullian no friend to infant-baptism; which makes Mr. Wall begin his citations from him with decrying his authority—His general expressions no argument for pædobaptism—Tertullian's steady meaning easy to be come at, without Mr. Wall's extravagant guesses—Tertullian's mentioning infant-baptism no argument it was practised in his time; but only that some were endeavouring to bring in the practice—Tertullian does not simply advise (as Mr. Wall pretends) to defer the baptizing of children, but argues against it as a thing that ought not to be done—The reading of the passage, on which Mr. Wall grounds his supposition, altogether impertinent and absurd—Tertullian's doctrine concerning baptism inconsistent with pædobaptism—His exposition of 1 Cor. vii. 14. not in favour of baptism—Not one author cited of the first three centuries, who understands that text of baptism—Mr. Wall's endeavours to prove that *ἄγιος*, &c., means *washed*, &c., ineffectual—The sense given by the bishop of Sarum and by Dr. Whitby cannot be the true one—The best interpretation which can be made upon our author's own principles, is that he so much despises, viz. that by holiness is meant legitimacy—This proved to be the true sense—*Holy* never signifies *baptize*—When Mr. Wall comes to Origen, he cites some passages which are plain to his purpose—But they are only taken from Latin translations—The passage some cite from the Greek remains of this Father (as Mr. Wall himself confesses) proves nothing—The Latin translations from whence the main citations are taken are very corrupt and licentious—Several learned men confess it—As Grotius, Huetius, Daillé, Du Pin, Tarinus—Which is also abundantly proved by comparing the translation with the Greek fragments, as now extant—St. Hierome was not more



faithful in his translations than Ruffinus—It is very probable they took this liberty in all other things, as well as in those particularly for which Origen was questioned—Ruffinus, notwithstanding what Mr. Wall says to the contrary, took as much liberty with the Epistle to the Romans as he did with other books—He expressly says he had added many things—Besides, that commentary was very much interpolated before Ruffinus took it in hand—As to the passage taken out of the Homilies on Joshua, it is at best doubtful whether he speaks of infants in age—In one part of these Homilies he has inserted, though it be not in the original, this passage particularly, which is the ground of the pædobaptists' argument—In St. Cyprian's time infant-baptism was practised in Africa; and probably first took rise there, together with infant-communion—The Africans, generally men of weak understanding—The Greek church, probably, had not yet admitted the error—The inference from the whole—A recapitulation—A reason why so much only of Mr. Wall's history as relates to the first centuries, is examined—How infant-baptism was at first brought in use—Errors sprung up in the church very early—This of infant-baptism not brought in all at once, but by degrees: and was occasioned in some measure by their zeal, which was not always according to knowledge, as several other things were—A parallel betwixt this practice and the popish notion of transubstantiation—When John iii. 5. was understood to relate to infants, as well as others, no wonder infants were baptized—Upon just such another mistake of our Saviour's words in John vi. 53, the earliest pædobaptists admitted children to the Lord's supper—Conclusion.

---

SIR,

BEFORE I examine what our author urges from Tertullian, I will give you an argument against infant-baptism which naturally falls in about this time: it is, for aught I know, wholly new, and perhaps may not be unacceptable; if it be, you may easily pass it over, for it is but short.

I take it from the letter Polycrates writ to Victor concerning Easter, wherein he says thus: 'I Polycrates, the meanest of you all, according to the tradition of my kinsmen, some of whom also I follow; for seven of my relations were bishops, and I am the eighth, and they always celebrated the feast, when the people removed the leaven: I, therefore, brethren, who am sixty-five years old in the Lord<sup>a</sup>, &c. Now from these words I gather, 1. That this bishop was descended of Christian parents; than which nothing can seem more probable, since he himself assures us there had been so many bishops in the family, and it is likely his father

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. 24. s. 5. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ ὁ μικρότερος πάντων ὑμῶν Πολυκράτης, κατὰ παράδοσιν τῶν συγγενῶν μου, οἷς καὶ παρηκολούθησα τισὶν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὰ μὲν ἦσαν συγγενεῖς μου ἐπίσκοποι, ἐγὼ

δὲ ὄγδοος καὶ πάντοτε τὴν ἡμέραν ἡγαγον οἱ συγγενεῖς μου, ὅταν ὁ λαὸς ἤρνευε τὴν ζύμην· ἐγὼ οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐξήκοντα πέντε ἔτη ἔχων ἐν Κυρίῳ, &c.



was one. Mr. Dodwell, speaking of hereditary priesthood, says, 'The priesthood came by inheritance to Scopelianus, an orator in Asia, as Philostratus testifies; and in like manner perhaps Poly-crates was eighth bishop of the same family in Asia<sup>b</sup>.'

2. Polycrates says he was sixty-five years old in the Lord; which plainly distinguishes between his natural age, and his age in the Lord: several instances of this way of speaking are to be met with in the New Testament. All which put together, I think, shews that though Polycrates was born of Christian parents, he was not baptized in his infancy; but, according to the use of the church of that time, when he was able to answer for himself. I think there is no need to prove any part of this; and therefore I leave the argument with you as it is, and proceed now to Tertullian.

Mr. Wall begins with lessening Tertullian's reputation, and accuses him of having fallen into 'great and monstrous errors.' Is all this severity against Tertullian, because his books afford several arguments against paedobaptism? Mr. Wall says, 'Tertullian has spoke so in this matter of infant-baptism, as that it is hard to reconcile the several passages with one another<sup>c</sup>:' which is pretty strange too; for our author cites but one place where this Father speaks of it at all, and there he speaks against it: and I do not see any need to reconcile this with other passages which do not speak of it.

But it seems Tertullian, in some places, speaks of the necessity of baptism in such general terms, as to reckon 'those that die unbaptized as lost men:' and from thence our author concludes, that to be sure Tertullian, and the church of that time, thought children ought to be baptized. The answer is short and easy; for he does, in as general terms, say, 'They who come to be baptized do, at the place and time of baptism, and before, in the church, renounce the Devil<sup>d</sup>;' &c. And he frequently says full as much of the necessity of faith as he does of baptism; in imitation of the Scriptures, which say, that now *God hath commanded all men every where to repent, Acts xvii. 30. And that he will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, 1 Tim. ii. 4. Again, Without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. xi. 6. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord, Heb. xii. 14. Ter-*

<sup>b</sup> De jure Laic. Sacerdot. p. 220. Sacerdotium Scopeliano rhetori in Asia hereditarium fuisse testis est Philostratus, quo etiam exemplo fortasse Polycrates in eadem Asia octavus ejusdem familie gessit inter Christianos episcopatum.

<sup>c</sup> [Part i. p. 55.]

<sup>d</sup> De Corona, p. 102 A. Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu contestamur nos renunciare Diabolo. [Cap. 3.]

tullian cannot possibly express himself more universally than these holy writers have here done, and yet nobody imagines infants are included; and therefore such expressions afford no more reason to say, Tertullian any where countenances the baptism of infants, than when he says, ‘This command is given to all, Seek, and ye shall find.’

After Mr. Wall has cited several passages which he thinks a little inconsistent with one another, he pretends to guess at what might be ‘his steady meaning (if he had any<sup>f</sup>);’ for that is very doubtful in our author’s opinion. But indeed I think it is easy to see that Tertullian thought baptism was necessary to all such as had heard of Christ, and of its institution; and that such could not be saved if they refused to own his authority; but he says no such thing of others, who were incapable of knowing or doing the Divine will. And therefore he excuses the patriarchs expressly from that necessity, because it was not possible they should practise what was then not instituted, or believe Jesus was the Messiah, when he was not yet come: the same thing in effect he says of infants too, where he opposes their being baptized till they are capable of knowing and desiring to come to Christ.

But our adversaries argue, since Tertullian mentions infant-baptism, it must have been known and practised in his time; and though he opposes it, his private opinion signifies nothing: for it is the practice of the church, and not the opinion of one doctor, which is to be regarded. To this we may return;—

1. That Tertullian, as is plain from many other places, speaks so of baptism, as is utterly inconsistent with pædobaptism; and the passage particularly here referred to, if it were a little doubtful, might be cleared up by them.

2. That it at most only proves, there were some persons at that time, who among many other wild notions were about to introduce this of the necessity of baptism to the salvation of infants; and not, as Mr. Wall pretends, that it was the opinion of the church, or that they practised infant-baptism.

Had it been the settled practice and judgment of the church, and what they thought was supported by the authority and tradition of the apostles, &c., it cannot be imagined that Tertullian should venture to oppose it; or if he did, that he should employ no more

<sup>e</sup> De Præscript. ad Hæretic. p. 205 D. Omnibus dictum sit, Quærite et invenietis, &c. [cap. 9.]

<sup>f</sup> Part i. p. 28. [60.]

<sup>g</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 13. p. 229 D.

pains to excuse what seemed to contradict the doctrine and practice of the apostles and the whole church.

But, says Mr. Wall, it is plain Tertullian only pleaded for deferring the baptism of infants when there was no immediate danger of death, because in some (which he takes to be the truer) copies, it is said, 'For what need is there unless in cases of necessity,' &c., implying, that in cases of danger they ought indeed to be baptized without delay: but the tautology of these words seems very impertinent, as if Tertullian had argued thus; either there is some necessity, or there is no necessity; if there is no necessity, then what necessity is there? For the passage, as Mr. Wall would read it, will run exactly thus: 'What necessity is there unless there be a necessity?' Pamelius, upon whose authority our author builds, confesses he has it only from Gagnæus, whose single judgment is not sufficient. Rigaltius notes<sup>g</sup>, that 'copies differ,' and says that the old Paris edition, meaning that of Gagnæus, (but without adding any other that does so too,) foolishly repeats the word *necesse*. And Grotius<sup>h</sup>, observing the same variety, confesses he 'cannot see what tolerable sense those words can have;' and therefore he leaves them out as spurious. And till better authorities can be produced to confirm that reading, we shall think the repetition too silly for Tertullian, and therefore reject it.

It is frivolous to say Tertullian is as much against the baptism of all unmarried persons, &c., as of infants; as Mr. Wall does from bishop Felli. He advises such, indeed, as are in any danger of sinning, to delay their being baptized; but he plainly opposes the baptism of infants upon quite different topics, namely, because they are incapable of that sacrament, and because they have no need of it, and it ought not to be administered to them. He makes it therefore useless and unlawful to baptize infants; but does not intimate so of unmarried persons, &c.

How unfit infants are for baptism, he shews in other places; as when he says, 'The soul is sanctified not by washing, but by *the answer of a good conscience*<sup>k</sup>;' as St. Peter says, 1 Epist. ch. iii. 21, to which place Tertullian probably alludes. And again, to omit abundance more which might be cited, arguing about the use and necessity of repentance, he says, 'baptism is the seal of faith; which faith is begun and adorned by the faith of repentance. We are

<sup>g</sup> In the first edition, anno 1634. [I do not find any such remark in that edition; namely, folio, Paris. 1634.]

<sup>h</sup> In Matth. xix. 14.

<sup>i</sup> In Cyprian, Epist. 64.

<sup>k</sup> De Resurrection. cap. 48. p. 355 B. Anima non lavatione sed responsione sancitur.



‘not therefore washed that we may leave sinning, but because we have already done it, and are already purified in our hearts!’ Are these the words of a man who thought baptism might be given to infants? Are infants already purified in heart? Have they left sinning? And are they therefore washed? Have they any such faith as Tertullian here speaks of? And yet he says, baptism is the seal of this sort of faith particularly; and therefore doubtless he thought the seal could not be regularly applied where this faith was wanting. But our adversaries do not much heed what Tertullian says, he being so much against them; though if he is thought to speak any thing in their favour, he is a good authority enough. And therefore Mr. Wall was unwilling to slip the occasion of noting from Tertullian’s exposition of 1 Cor. vii. 14, that those words are by him understood of baptism, and the holiness there spoken of, is *baptismal holiness*. But what advantage he proposed to himself by this I cannot guess; for he allows Tertullian paraphrases *holy* by *designed for holiness*, and therefore only meant at most that they were designed to be baptized in time, which is opposite to the sense the modern paedobaptists plead for.

Besides, I do not see Tertullian gives any intimation that he understood this passage to relate to baptism at all; on the contrary, he says, they are ‘holy by the prerogative of that seed, and ‘the instruction in their education<sup>m</sup>,’ but not a word of baptism: nay he, as plainly as words can express, refers to the cleanness or holiness of birth, and understands St. Paul so too, when he repeats his sense thus, ‘of either parent sanctified, the children are born ‘holy.’ I hope you do not think he meant they were born *baptized*; and again he adds, ‘otherwise they would be born unclean;’ which passages Mr. Wall has not rightly translated, as you may see by comparing his English with the Latin.

Though Mr. Wall has taken such pains<sup>n</sup> to shew, the ancients generally understood this passage concerning baptism, yet he has not once attempted to shew that any of the Fathers of the first three hundred years understood it so; and I do not remember that a single instance can be produced for it from their writings, though I might easily produce several to the contrary from St. Irenæus, St. Clement of Alexandria, &c. And as for the following centuries, in which infant-baptism, together with a multitude of intolerable

<sup>l</sup> De Pœnitentia, cap. 6. p. 125 B. Lavacrum illud obsignatio est fidei, quæ fides a pœnitentiæ fide incipitur et commendatur. Non ideo abluimur, ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desiimus: quo-

niam jam corde loti sumus.

<sup>m</sup> De Anima, cap. 39. Tam ex seminis prerogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplina. [p. 294 B.]

<sup>n</sup> Part i. p. 217, &c. [239, &c.]



errors, prevailed in the church, it is not to be wondered at, if several passages of Scripture were strangely misapplied to defend them.

To as little purpose are all Mr. Wall's endeavours to shew<sup>o</sup> the words *ἅγιος, ἀγιαζεσθαι, ἀγιάζειν*, &c., mean *to wash*, or *baptize*. For, not to enter nicely into the examination of the matter, it is plain they much more commonly mean no such thing; in Scripture they signify *to consecrate*, Ezek. xxii. 26; *to hallow*, Matt. vi. 9; and sometimes they mean the sanctification of our lives and actions, Lev. xx. 7, and frequently elsewhere. For what reason then will our adversaries so resolutely fix a sense here, that is seldom if ever used, rather than any of the more common and easy acceptations? Why may not we read the place, 'the unbelieving husband has been prevailed on by the believing wife to forsake his former vices and irregular course of life,' &c., as well as according to the pædo-baptist's paraphrase? especially since the apostle in the next verse but one shews he had that in his mind, *For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?*<sup>r</sup> &c. It is thus Origen seems to understand it by his saying, 'When the husband believes first, he sometimes saves his wife; and when the wife believes first, she *persuades* her husband<sup>q</sup>.'

Dr. Whitby is very accurate in proving the words speak only of seminal holiness, as is also the right reverend bishop of Sarum<sup>r</sup>: but if this were allowed, it does not immediately follow the children must be baptized, because the parents are believers; which our adversaries take for granted, though it is the very thing in question. And the whole argument depends upon this *petitio principii*, as is plain if we put it into form. All the holy seed, that is, all who are born of Christian parents, ought to be baptized: but infants are the holy seed, therefore infants are to be baptized.

Besides, it cannot be pretended that *sanctified* means seminally holy in the former part of the verse; which makes it the more unlikely it means so in the latter part, though it should signify so elsewhere.

Nay, further, upon the hypothesis of some of our adversaries, which is also the most rational by far, what St. Paul says here is utterly false, and must appear so to all considerate men. The only reason why infants are to be admitted to baptism, St. Paul says,

<sup>o</sup> Part i. p. 82 83, &c. [113, 114, &c.]

<sup>p</sup> [See Dr. Wall's 'Defence,' on this exposition of Origen's sentiments on the texts in question.]

<sup>q</sup> In Matt. p. 332. "Οτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ πρό-

τερον πιστεύσας τῷ χρόνῳ σώζει τὴν γυναῖκα, ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἀρχαμένη ὑστερόν ποτε πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα. [Comment. xiii. cap. 28. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>r</sup> Articles, p. 305, 306. [article XXVII.]

according to them, is, that one of the parents is Christian; but if so, then all others, though brought to be baptized by ever so good sureties, are not to be admitted, for they are unclean; but this is contrary to God's infinite goodness and justice, and also to the hypothesis which the most judicious paedobaptists now generally follow. And besides, it gives the Jewish dispensation the advantage over the Christian in this respect, that the infants born of heathen parents might be brought to circumcision, and so entered into that covenant; whereas the grace of Christ must be limited to narrower bounds, while none can be admitted but those born of at least one Christian parent.

The justest interpretation which can be made upon our author's own principles, I think, is that which he so much despises, namely, that by *holiness* is only meant *legitimacy*. For if proselytism, among the Jews, dissolved all natural ties and relations, so as to make it lawful for a man to marry his own mother<sup>s</sup>, &c., because she could now no longer be accounted his mother; and if it made it unlawful for a man to cohabit with his former wife, she being also no longer accounted his wife; and if the Christians thought their regeneration to Christianity as extensive as that of the Jews, from whom they borrowed this notion<sup>t</sup>, what can be more proper and natural than to suppose St. Paul is endeavouring to put better thoughts into his converts, and persuade them that their proselytism did not dissolve natural bonds and consanguinity, and that it was not only lawful, but advisable and a duty, for the wife to dwell with her husband? for he is still her legitimate true husband; otherwise indeed, says he, your children would be unclean, as bastards were accounted; but the husband being legitimate, the children are so too.

This sense is derived from our author's own principles, and therefore, I think, he ought not to except against it. And it seems to be the true one, if we observe that the holiness of the children is said to result, not from the Christianity of either parent, but from the husband's being sanctified by, or to the wife. Now what can this holiness be, which springs from thence? The baptism of the parents cannot serve for the children, nor do I see that in any other sense, beside what is given, the sanctification of the parents can denominate the children holy.

And though I cannot allow of Mr. Wall's hypothesis concerning the pretended Jewish regeneration, yet I urge this to be the true sense of the place, because it is otherwise plain the Jews did not

<sup>s</sup> Wall's Introd. p. 21. [19.]

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. [20.]

think it lawful to continue with a stranger in marriage, Nehem. xiii. 23, &c., as neither did the Christians, as may appear from St. Justin Martyr's Apology. And the Greek church, even to this day, account it unlawful to marry with any out of their own communion, for all such they look upon as heathens, out of the Lord; and the children of such marriages are to them but bastards. Under the Jewish dispensation indeed it was unlawful; but when Christ came, he disallowed the divorcees Moses had tolerated for *the hardness of their hearts*: it is true, he still left it unlawful to marry out of the Lord; but as for marriages already contracted in unbelief, though one party afterwards became a believer, the Christian law did not oblige to put away the other who did not believe, for Christ allows no cause of divorce, *but fornication only*. Since then a mistake in this doctrine did arise in the church, and St. Paul is expressly speaking of this very case, and endeavouring to convince them, as appears by the whole context, of their error; what can be more natural than to take the words in the sense Mr. Wall so scornfully rejects?

But however, I think it is past all doubt, the word *holy* cannot signify *baptized*, as Mr. Wall would have it, and none of his instances prove it does. Lev. vi. 27, for example, only expresses, that whatever touched the flesh of the sin-offering should *be sanctified*; the word is general, and must be understood to mean, according to the directions given in the law, and imports no more: and if they sanctified such things by washing, it was not from any such sense in the word *sanctify*, which signifies no one way more than another, but from particular precepts which determined the way of sanctifying; as in some cases it was by making such things as *abide the fire to go through the fire*, Numb. xxxi. 23; and in this of touching the flesh of a sin-offering, perhaps it was by washing, though this is not expressed; but if it were, why should we hence pretend *sanctify* means *wash*, any more than that it signifies *to anoint*, because in Exod. xxix. 36, it is said of the altar, *Thou shalt anoint it to sanctify it*? And, in short, why may not *sanctified* and *holy*, in the passage in dispute, be understood in the same sense in which our Lord says, *The temple sanctifieth the gold*, and that *the altar sanctifieth the gift*, Matt. xxiii. 17, 19? Here is plainly no manner of reference to *washing*. Why may not the husband be sanctified by the wife, and the children by both, in the same sense as the gold is sanctified by the temple, whatever that be? And the sense I put upon the words will appear the more probable, if it be observed, that the Jews use קדוש to signify *chaste*, as Castellus

notes on the word, and קדשה for *a harlot*. And Buxtorf<sup>t</sup> informs us, the word was used by the rabbins to express ‘the consecration of the bride to the bridegroom, &c., in marriage;’ and so קדוש is used for the ‘thing, (viz. the ring or gift,) by which the ceremony of betrothing is performed<sup>u</sup>.’ And so the third book of the Seder נשים is called קדושין, because it treats of matrimonial contracts, the several ways of betrothing and consecrating, and decides many difficult cases which arise on these points. All this is highly in favour of the exposition I give; while our adversaries can make no use of St. Paul’s words, till they can prove that by *holy* he meant *baptized*, or else, that because children are here said to be holy, they must therefore be baptized, which they are pleased generally to take for granted.

The next author Mr. Wall argues from is Origen. And here indeed we confess, the passages cited are very full and plain testimonies for infant-baptism; for as Mr. Wall says, ‘The plainness is such as needs nothing to be said of it, nor admits anything to be said against it<sup>x</sup>.’ But yet we may observe,

1. That these, which are the only direct clear passages yet produced to our author’s purpose, are not Origen’s own words, but taken from a licentious Latin translation, while not the least colour of any thing can be urged from what remains of that Father’s in the Greek, and yet we have more of his in the Greek than of any Father who wrote before him. And, I think, this is very remarkable, that what St. Origen says in favour of infant-baptism, should be all in those Latin translations, and nothing of the same nature to be met with in such considerable remains in the Greek. Some indeed cite a passage from the Greek, which Mr. Wall thinks is better let alone; for the whole force of it, he says, depends upon an artful leaving out such words as puzzle the cause; had they been indeed left out in the original by Origen, Mr. Wall thinks ‘he must there have been understood of infants in age<sup>y</sup>.’ But I see no such necessity of this: the place, it is true, had been much more doubtful, and perhaps might as well have been understood of such, as of men resembling infants; but it could not have been necessary to understand it of infants in age; for why might not Origen have meant the same thing he does now, though he had not expressed himself so clearly?

<sup>t</sup> Lexic. Talmud. ad Voc. Col. 1978. Apud rabbinos præterea קדש synecdochice dicitur de consecratione sponsæ ad conjugium.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. Col. 1980. Res ipsa, per quam

fit desponsatio, veluti annulus aut donum, quo desponsatur puella.

<sup>x</sup> Part i. p. 35. [66.]

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 40 [71.]



But since the words are put in, they unavoidably shew he did not speak of infants in age: and sir Peter King's proving the same word is at some pages' distance used by Origen for infants in age, does not prove it must mean so here too. The Father is speaking of guardian angels, and puts this question, 'Whether they take the care and management of persons, from the time when they by the washing of regeneration, whereby they were new-born, do as new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word,' &c. It is strange Mr. Wall should say, after all his pretences to impartiality and fairness, that the 'mention of their desiring of the milk of the word at the time of their baptism, makes it doubtful (only) whether he meant of such who are infants in a proper sense<sup>z</sup>:' for it can be no doubt to any man in his wits, whether infants of a month or two can desire the sincere milk of the word. But Mr. Wall goes on to observe, that the answer Origen gives to this question increases the doubt; and this he grounds upon these words: 'The time of people's unbelief is under the angels of Satan; and then after their new birth, he that has bought us with his own blood delivers them to a good angel.' I am confident nobody can imagine these words are spoken of infants; and therefore, quite contrary to Mr. Wall's pretence, they take away all ambiguity which might have been in the words, and clearly shew, that Origen spoke, not of infants in age, but only of such *little ones as believe in Christ*.

Besides this, I do not remember any thing is cited from Origen in the Greek, which are his only authentic pieces: but many things might be strongly urged from thence against the baptism of infants. I have already cited on another occasion a passage very much to this purpose; and it is certain as to the rest, that wherever he speaks of baptism, he speaks of it in relation to the adult only.

2. But the next observation I make, and which utterly invalidates all Mr. Wall's citations, is; that they are not only taken from translations instead of originals, but that those translations are made with abundance of liberty, without keeping to the sense of the original, and therefore they cannot be thought authentic enough to ground an argument upon them; for we can never know what Origen says, from what the translators have altered and inserted. The translations of the Fathers, it is notorious, have a very bad name, and those of Origen in particular.

Cassiodorus, somewhere speaking of Clemens Alexandrinus' commentaries on the canonical Epistles, says, 'He has expressed many things very acutely, and some very unwarily; which we have

<sup>z</sup> Part i. p. 41. [72.]

‘caused to be translated into Latin, in such a manner, as, omitting what might give offence, his pure and wholesome doctrine might be the more safely imbibed<sup>a</sup>.’ And as to Origen in particular, Grotius says, ‘A great deal of what is ascribed to him is an unknown author’s, and a great deal is interpolated<sup>b</sup>.’ And Huetius, who has perhaps taken the most pains with Origen of any man, says in general of his remains, that they are very imperfect and much abused, or else changed and ‘deformed by abominable translation<sup>c</sup>.’ Mr. Daillé makes his earnings of this, and notes that Rufinus ‘has so filthily mangled, and so licentiously confounded the writings of Origen, &c., which he has translated into Latin, that you will hardly find a page where he has not re-trenched, or added, or altered something<sup>d</sup>.’ Mr. Du Pin several times repeats the same thing, and says, ‘Those [pieces] which we have in Latin are translated by Rufinus and others with so much liberty, that it is a difficult matter to discern what is Origen’s own, from what has been foisted in by the interpreter<sup>e</sup>.’ In another place he says, ‘Rufinus gave himself a great deal of liberty in his translations, and kept more to the sense which he judged ought to be given to authors, than to their words. In short, his translations are paraphrases rather than literal and faithful versions. He hath used much freedom particularly in Eusebius’ History, and in Origen’s Treatises, where he hath changed, added, and struck out many things, as he acknowledgeth himself<sup>f</sup>.’ And again, ‘St. Hierome,’ he says, ‘somewhere upbraids him with it: and besides, this appears by the translation itself, which is full of figures, and allusions to Latin words; of terms taken in another sense than what they were in Origen’s time, where the Trinity and other mysteries are expressed in such terms as were not used till after the council of Nice, and where there are points of discipline more modern than Origen’s age; which has given occasion to those who have not considered the liberty that Rufinus took of adding or leaving out what he pleased, to doubt whether the greatest part of these works were Origen’s or no. The liberty which Rufinus has given himself is still more evident, by what he has written in the prologue to his version of the commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans, which, he says, he has abridged by above the half. St.

<sup>a</sup> Cassiodor. *Inst. Divin. Lect. lib. i.* Ubi multa quidem subtiliter, sed aliqua incaute locutus est: quæ nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis, purificata doctrina ejus securior posset hauriri. [*Apud Biblioth. Patrum, tom. vi. p. 55 C. edit. Paris. 1575.*]

<sup>b</sup> In *Matth. xix. 14.* Cui quæ ascri-

buntur quædam sunt incerti auctoris quædam interpolata.

<sup>c</sup> Origenian. *lib. iii. cap. 2. sect. 3. § 1.* Perversis interpretationibus deformatæ.

<sup>d</sup> *De usu Patrum, lib. i. cap. 4.*

<sup>e</sup> *Hist. Eccles. vol. i. p. 117. [p. 100. edit. 1693.]*

<sup>f</sup> *Hist. Eccles. vol. iii. p. 108.*

‘Hierome’s versions are not more exact<sup>g</sup>.’ To these we may add an expression of Tarinus, in his notes on the Philocalia, who says, ‘Ruffinus has perverted the whole proem, and, as he usually does, altogether forsakes the original<sup>h</sup>.’

And all this is abundantly evident, not only from this cloud of unexceptionable witnesses, but also from comparing the versions with the originals as now extant, which you may do at your leisure, and also from their own confessions in the several introductions and closes published together with the translations.

What man in the world could persuade himself that an argument may be founded on such versions? For how can he know whether Origen spoke any thing like what he now reads, since the translators were so scandalously guilty of altering and putting in what they pleased? And since Mr. Wall allows this too, he to be sure should not have urged these passages.

But to this objection, which he owns is very considerable, he answers, 1. That though Ruffinus was so guilty in this point, yet St. Hierome took a more faithful method, ‘expressing every thing ‘as it was in the original<sup>i</sup>.’ and therefore, since the passage he transcribes from the commentaries on St. Luke, translated by St. Hierome, contains the same thing in effect with those transcribed from Ruffinus’ translations, it is to be supposed Ruffinus altered nothing in those particulars.

But, sir, you need only compare St. Hierome’s translations with the originals, to see that his versions, as monsieur Du Pin says, ‘are ‘not more exact’ than those of Ruffinus; many things he has left out, and given a different turn to others, as might be shewn in abundance of instances. His version of Eusebius’ Chronicon is a great example of his liberty in translating: as is also his book *De Locis Hebraicis*, in the preface of which he confesses he has omitted what he thought not worth remembering, and altered the greatest part of it. Nay, he owns he took such a freedom in translating Origen<sup>k</sup>, as to strike out what was dangerous, and leave only that which was useful; which made Scaliger say, St. Hierome was but a bad translator<sup>l</sup>.

2. In the next place our author pretends, that whatever might have been altered and interpolated in other matters, there is no manner of probability any thing was done so in the point of infant-

<sup>g</sup> Hist. Eccles. vol. i. p. 132. [p. 100. edit. 1693.]

<sup>h</sup> Ad cap. i. p. 1. ver. 28. Totum porro hoc proemium Ruffinus contorsit, et ut solet, in alia omnia abiit.

<sup>i</sup> Part. i. p. 36. [67.]

<sup>k</sup> Epist. lxii. ad Theoph. Alex. [Ep. lxxxii. edit. Vallars.] Et lib. ii. Apol. contra Ruffin.

<sup>l</sup> Scaligerana, p. 191.

baptism; because it was none of the subjects on which Origen's opinion was questioned at that time. But Mr. Wall might as well pretend they *left out* nothing but what related to those points, as that they *altered* nothing else; which however would be false. And you may remember, monsieur Du Pin observes that the translations contain several points of discipline more modern than Origen's age: and though they took particular care of those things which were disputed, yet it does not follow they made no manner of alteration in any others: on the contrary, it is very likely, they who had once given themselves a liberty to make their author speak their thoughts, have done it oftener than we are aware. And that they did so, you will be convinced by revising Origen's fragments with their translations; where, through ignorance or carelessness, or whatever might be the cause, there are a great many deviations from the originals in passages which do not concern the points on which Origen's opinion was questioned.

Besides, when the translators own the fact so fully, and warn their readers of the great alterations they have made, it is not to be supposed they would be understood to have altered only those things which were disputed; but that they altered so much, that some people thought they should rather have published the work under their own names, as the authors, and not as translators; which appears from the peroration at the end of the version of the commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans. And in Ruffinus' version of the fragment of this commentary, which makes the twenty-fifth chapter of the Philocalia, there are hardly any footsteps of the original preserved, or any thing in which they agree.

3. In the third place, our author says, though Ruffinus usually took such a latitude, and so strangely altered the commentary on Leviticus more especially, yet he dealt otherwise with that on the Epistle to the Romans, from which the principal citation is taken; for Ruffinus only says, 'he had shortened this work by one half, but speaks of no addition. And it is in this,' says our author, 'that there is mention of the tradition from the apostles,' that baptism should be given to infants. Observe the inference; a man, who was wont to put out, insert, and change whatever he pleased with an unbounded liberty, must now be supposed only to have shortened the work without any addition or change, because he only says, 'he had shortened it,' and does not say he added any thing to it: but neither does he say the contrary, and therefore it is unreasonable to suppose he acted here differently from his constant practice.



Nay, he confesses, he has added many things of his own; for he says, 'that there was a great deal of the body of the book wanting, in all libraries<sup>m</sup>.' And this he has endeavoured in some measure to supply. And in the peroration, he adds<sup>n</sup>, 'They tell me, there is so much of your own in these things, that you ought to call them by your own name, and entitle the work, An Explication of the Epistle to the Romans, by Hierome [Ruffinus<sup>o</sup>,] for example,' &c., which is a sign there was less of Origen in this work than of the translator. To this Ruffinus answers, without denying the charge: 'But I have more regard to my conscience than to a great name; and though I add some things, and supply what was wanting, and shorten what seems too long, I do not think I therefore ought to put my own name in the title, and rob him of the work who laid the foundation, and furnished materials for the structure<sup>p</sup>.'

If therefore we may take Ruffinus' own word for it, he has made as free with this commentary on the Romans, as with the other pieces he translated. Which is likewise incontestably evident, if you compare, as I said before, the twenty-fifth chapter of the Philocalia with Ruffinus' version. Besides it may be added, that the commentary was miserably interpolated before Ruffinus took it in hand, which he complains of in the preface; and therefore if he had been ever so faithful, no certain argument could be drawn from these commentaries.

Mr. Wall cites another passage, from the Homilies on Joshua, in these words; 'According to that saying of our Lord concerning infants, (and thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized;) *their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*' And to strengthen this, he says, 'Though this part of Origen's works be not extant in Greek, yet we may the more depend upon it, because Ruffinus assures us, that in the translation of these

<sup>m</sup> Præfat. Desunt enim fere apud omnium bibliothecas (incertum sane quo casu) aliquanta ex ipso corpore volumina.

<sup>n</sup> Aiunt enim mihi; in his quæ scribis, quoniam plurima in eis tui operis habentur, da titulum nominis tui, et scribe Rufini (verbi gratia) in Epistolam ad Romanos explanationum libri.

<sup>o</sup> [It is rather surprising that Mr. Gale should here, both in the quotation and his own version of it have substituted the name of *Jerome* for that of *Ruffinus*, thereby wholly destroying the force of his illustration. It would almost seem that he had taken the quotation at second

hand from some careless copyist, and in his hurry had failed to perceive that the drift of the argument lies here; 'people say to me, there is so little of *Jerome's* here and so much of your own, why do you not at once affix *your* name to the books instead of *his*, and call them *Ruffinus's* explication.']

<sup>p</sup> Verum ego, qui plus conscientie meæ quam nomini defero, etiamsi addere aliqua videor, et explere quæ desunt, aut brevare quæ longa sunt, furari tamen titulum ejus qui fundamenta operis jecit, et construendi ædificii materiam præbuit, rectum non puto.

‘ Homilies, &c., he has neither added nor omitted any thing, but ‘ truly rendered what he found in the Greek books<sup>q</sup>.’ But,

1. It is doubtful, as Mr. Wall himself also notes, whether by ‘ thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized,’ he means an infant in age, or only in a spiritual sense. And,

2. Though Rufinus says he has translated these Homilies as he found them in the Greek, he only means in comparison with the liberty he usually took with other books: but that he added and very much altered even these Homilies too, cannot well be doubted; for if we compare that fragment of the twentieth homily, which is the twelfth chapter of the Philocalia, with his translation, you will see nothing can be more different; and particularly he inserts these words; ‘ As the Lord said of the little ones of the church, that their ‘ angels do always stand before the Lord, and see his face.’ Which are not in the Greek of Origen; and therefore, as Rufinus has added them here of his own head, it is as probable he did so in the other passage our author cites. Thus, upon the whole, I think it sufficiently appears, that what is urged from Origen for paedobaptism has no force in it.

After Origen, St. Cyprian follows in Mr. Wall’s quotations; who, I confess, does plainly enough speak of infant-baptism, as practised in Africa in his time. But it is to be noted, he speaks as plainly of infant-communion too; and therefore if his authority is sufficient for admitting infants to one sacrament, it ought to be allowed sufficient for the admitting them to the other also. It is to be observed likewise, that the first mention we have of infant-baptism is from these Carthaginian Fathers, which makes it very probable that it began first at Carthage. It was attempted in Tertullian’s time; and he, you know, sir, opposed it strenuously. But notwithstanding, it took footing there shortly after, and was very common in St. Cyprian’s time; and St. Austin thought it an apostolical tradition; just as dipping, from being held necessary, was first dispensed with in some extraordinary cases, then counted indifferent; and afterwards wholly laid aside, nay counted unlawful too; and all within the space of half a century, here in England; and the error grew as fast among the Africans, who were generally men of weak understandings. Mr. Wall himself makes Fidus but an indifferent man for a bishop, when he says, ‘ all he objected of sense was the ‘ rule of circumcision on the eighth day<sup>r</sup>.’ And truly I must agree with him, there was not much sense in the other things he urged, nor indeed in this neither: for he might as well have baptized on

<sup>q</sup> Part i. p. 42. [73, 74.]

<sup>r</sup> Part i. p. 52. [86.]

the seventh day, because God rested thereon ; as on the eighth day, because Isaac was circumcised thereon. But however, if Fidus was satisfied with St. Cyprian's answer, I think this far the greatest argument of his weakness, that he could suffer himself to be imposed on with so trifling and empty a reply.

But though the African bishops were no wiser than to admit the error, perhaps only as an indifferent thing, or in cases of danger ; the Greek churches seem very plainly to have been still of another opinion. For Dionysius, the illustrious bishop of Alexandria, in an epistle to Dionysius a presbyter, and afterwards bishop of Rome, concerning Novatian, says, ' he utterly disallows of holy baptism, ' and subverts the faith and profession which goes before it<sup>s</sup>. ' As this great man speaks of baptism in general, so he must be understood to mean, that in his judgment there was, at that time, a faith and profession always to precede it. And it is impossible a man who never dreamed of infant-baptism should speak more plainly against it : nor can we expect to find any passages more inconsistent with that practice than this is.

It will not be worth our while to examine how the error advanced in after-times, and by what arts and changes it extended itself, and became so universally established as we see it at present. It is sufficient that the Scriptures, the only infallible rule of our faith and practice, are found not to favour the cause we disown ; and that the authority of the primitive fathers also, for at least two hundred and fifty years after Christ, give no countenance to our adversaries, but are rather against them. I think we have abundant reason therefore to persist in the opinion and practice we profess, notwithstanding the greatest numbers of the most learned and most powerful are against us ; and have been so, it may be, several hundred years.

But to sum up the evidence something more at large, I must desire you to remember it has been clearly proved :

I. First in regard to the pretended silence of the Scriptures ;  
1. That instead of yielding our adversaries any argument, it follows strongly from thence, that paedobaptism can be no institution of Christ, as being nowhere mentioned in the only authentic Christian records. And therefore to teach and practise, and much more to impose it on others, as an ordinance of Christ, is altogether unwarrantable. 2. That the Scriptures are not so silent in this respect as is pretended ; and that though they do not expressly mention

<sup>s</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. c. 8. Τὸ λουτρὸν ἀθετοῦντι τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τήν τε πρὸ αὐτοῦ πίστιν καὶ ὁμολογίαν ἀνατρέποντι.

and forbid to baptize infants, they do yet require and make such conditions and circumstances necessary in those who are to be admitted, as sufficiently and unavoidably exclude infants as much as if it had been said expressly, *infants are not* to be baptized. And this I proved by shewing, among other things, that the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, more especially, is so expressed, as by no means to admit of infants. And here, to take off all the pretences the pædobaptists can be supposed to make, and withal the more strongly to enforce the argument we draw from the place, I have largely shewn, the Greek word *μαθητεύω* always, but more especially in this commission, necessarily includes teaching in its signification: 1. By its etymology, and the analogy of the Greek tongue; by many incontestable instances of its use in the Greek authors, whether profane or ecclesiastical, as well as in the Scriptures themselves, wherein it can be no otherwise understood: and by other synonymous words and phrases which frequently occur in parallel cases. To all which I added the allowance and confession of several of the most learned and judicious writers, even pædobaptists themselves. 2. By the constant and universal agreement of all the learned versions, and as many vernacular ones as I have had opportunity of consulting, which all render the word by *teach*. 3. By the authority of the ancient Fathers, who continually read and understand the word in that sense only. And lastly, by the more awful authority of the sacred Scriptures themselves, which do abundantly confirm our sense of the commission; by parallel places, and other allusions; and by shewing, that the apostles understood and obeyed the commission in this sense only.

II. After this, I considered the pretended practice of the Jews, which makes so much noise among the pædobaptists; and have shewn evidently, 1. That the authorities Mr. Wall cites from the Jews are not ancient enough to assure us what was practised either before, in, or near our Saviour's time. 2. That none of the passages so much as assert or intimate in the least, that the Jews baptized proselytes in Christ's time, which was the thing to be proved. 3. That the best passage Mr. Wall has does not necessarily mean baptism for proselytism, but may very probably speak of something else. 4. To these things I added, that some of the rabbins do speak against this ceremony, and make it clear, they neither allowed or knew of proselytory baptism, even in plainer words than any cited by Mr. Wall for his purpose. 5. And then utterly to invalidate all that is or can be said from the Jewish writings, I have shewn, by a great many passages taken from their best authors, and by the



testimony of the greatest judges, that the rabbins in general are such proud, false, senseless, whimsical, scandalous writers, as can never be depended on in any case; which makes their authority the most despicable and insignificant in the world: and therefore the baptism grounded on this foundation can be only a senseless rabbinical tradition.

I have also considered the passage he cites from Arrian; and shewn, 1. That this is likewise not ancient enough. 2. That he may, for aught appears to the contrary, speak only of the washings for pollution, and not for proselytism. 3. That he very probably speaks only of the Christians, whom he confounded with the Jews in this, as he has undoubtedly done in other places: and thus several learned men have understood it.

And as to his next argument from Gregory Nazianzen, and other Fathers, I have shewn, 1. That their authority in this case signifies nothing, as being too late. 2. That they cannot well be understood to speak of any thing but the legal washings for uncleannesses: and therefore all Mr. Wall advances to prove his position, that the Jews in our Saviour's time used to baptize their proselytes, indeed proves nothing at all.

And after all this, to confirm, as far as a negative can be proved, that the Jews had no such custom as is pretended, I have shewn, 1. That the Scriptures make no mention in the least of any such baptism; and that Exod. xix. 10, particularly, cannot be thought to do it. 2. That there is no instance or intimation of such baptism in any other authentic ancient history; but, on the contrary, a total silence, when they not only had the fairest occasions, but also ought to have mentioned that custom, if they had known it. 3. That the pretence of the pædobaptists is very improbable. 4. That several considerable authors, especially the ancients, do in effect deny they knew of any initiatory baptism among the Jews; and in their discourses on the Jewish ceremonies, never mention this as one. All which put together, I suppose, cannot well be thought any thing short of proving, the Jews had no such ceremony.

But besides all this, I have, from several other considerations, shewn, that though it could have been proved ever so certainly, that the Jews baptized their proselytes, this can do no service to the cause of pædobaptism; because, 1. It does not appear that their *infants* were admitted to that baptism. 2. Supposing proselytes and their children were usually baptized by the Jews, it does not follow their baptism must be a rule for the practice of Christians; for according to the pædobaptists themselves, there is no manner of

analogy between them. 3. Because our practice should rather be regulated by that of St. John and Christ, than by that of the Jews; and they, we are sure, as far as the Scripture can inform us, baptized no children. And lastly, because it is evident, that at most this supposed baptism is but a rabbinical tradition. For, 1. It is nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures. 2. The Jews themselves acknowledge it to be so; and the phrase of the Talmud in those very instances cited by our antagonists, even according to Maimonides' explication, imports, that it was neither instituted by Moses, nor can be concluded from any thing he writ, nor from any tradition from him, but is only founded in the lowest authority of the rabbins: and this heaven Christ has frequently enough cautioned us to beware of. And therefore, at last, from all it must follow, that the pretences our antagonists make, from the supposed Jewish practice and writings, can signify nothing to the support of paedobaptism.

III. And then, thirdly, as to the doctrine and practice of the ancient church, which Mr. Wall chiefly argues from; I have considered the first three centuries, and shewn, 1. in general that their authority alone is not sufficient to bear the weight of infant-baptism, though they should be found to assert it universally. 2. Mr. Wall forbears to mention St. Barnabas, who has some passages inconsistent with paedobaptism. 3. St. Clemens Romanus, with whom our author begins, and who, he says without any ground, speaks of original sin as affecting all mankind, does not however speak of infant-baptism, nor seem on any account whatever to have had it in his thoughts.

And whereas Mr. Wall argues, upon the supposition that St. Clemens esteems all persons tainted with original sin, that he likewise thought all ought to be baptized; I have observed, 1. That the premisses as well as the conclusion are not St. Clement's, but Mr. Wall's only. 2. Or secondly, that at best, according to our author, this only shews what was St. Clement's judgment, and not what was the practice of the church. Now though the church in general had these speculations, it would not at all follow they ventured barely upon that account to practise accordingly. 3. That it is all grounded on that uncharitable error, that none can be saved without being baptized. 4. That baptism does not appear to have been administered so much for original, as for actual sins. And lastly, that it no more follows from that principle that the ancient church practised infant-baptism, than that all the antipaedobaptists do so now; for they likewise hold the common notion of original sin.

IV. As to St. Hermas, Mr. Wall's next author, I have shewn,

1. That he speaks only of adult persons, who have heard and believe. 2. That he only describes visions, and therefore is not always to be taken literally. 3. That he cannot be thought to mean that those he represents to have been baptized in their separate estate after death, were actually baptized with material water. 4. That if we should give our author his whole argument, it would only prove Hermas was of opinion that infants shall be baptized in their separate state after death, which is nothing to our controversy.

In arguing from this Father, Mr. Wall compares some words of his with our Lord's saying, John iii. 5, *Except a man, &c.*, which gives me occasion to examine the argument the paedobaptists draw from thence. And I have, I think, fully shewn, 1. That the words cannot be taken so universally as to comprehend infants. 2. That by *kingdom of God* it is not necessary to understand the kingdom of glory. 3. That our Saviour's words refer only to adult persons, who have heard the word preached: 1. Because such only can possibly comply with the institution. 2. Such only can be saved by baptism. 3. What is there said, cannot be true of any other. And lastly, something in the words themselves necessarily limits them to adult persons.

In the same manner Mr. Wall gives me occasion likewise to examine what may be urged from Matt. xix. 14, *Suffer little children, &c.* And I observed, 1. That the words have no relation to baptism at all. But, 2. that the children were only brought to be touched and blessed. 3. That this was probably in order to heal them, or the like; and could not be, as Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Whitby suppose, to 'own them as belonging to his kingdom, nor to obtain for them 'some spiritual blessing appertaining to the kingdom of God.' 4. And lastly, that it does not follow from our Lord's saying, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven*, that there is, as Dr. Whitby asserts, any thing in little children why they should be brought to Christ, besides their being emblems of humility; much less, that they are fit to be early dedicated to the service of God, &c., by the Christian baptism.

V. After he has done with St. Hermas, Mr. Wall comes next to St. Justin Martyr. The first passage he cites is only to shew, that he spake of original sin as affecting all mankind. But I shew, 1. That if it were so, this is nothing to infant-baptism. 2. That St. Justin cannot fairly be understood to speak of original sin at all. 3. That Mr. Wall has very much misrepresented him and given a wrong translation of the words in favour of his assertion.

The next passage which, speaking of spiritual circumcision, says, ‘some have received it by baptism,’ Mr. Wall thinks is as much as to say, children ought to be baptized as well as they were wont to be circumcised. But I have clearly shewn, 1. That St. Justin does not call baptism circumcision. 2. That he could not mean baptism by the spiritual circumcision he mentions, both from these words themselves, and several other passages in his writings, which sufficiently evidence what he understood to be the Christian spiritual circumcision.

Here, to strengthen his assertions, our author compares some words of St. Justin with Col. ii. 11, 12, where he supposes St. Paul, by the circumcision there spoken of, means baptism. In answer to which I observe, 1. That the Scriptures nowhere call baptism *circumcision*, but that purity of heart, &c., is frequently called so. 2. That the words in themselves are such as cannot admit of so absurd an acceptance. 3. That the ancients cannot be thought to have understood them so. 4. That besides, if this were the meaning of St. Justin and St. Paul too, it does not follow that the Jewish practice, in regard to circumcision under the law, must be our rule in regard to baptism now. For, 1. Infants were *commanded* to be circumcised then, but *are not commanded* to be baptized now. 2. Circumcision was to be on the eighth day precisely, which cannot be urged of baptism. 3. Females were not to be circumcised then, and therefore it would as well follow they must not be baptized now. 4. The apostles did not make circumcision their rule in relation to baptism.

The next passage Mr. Wall produces from St. Justin, notwithstanding his pretences, argues very strongly against infant-baptism; but he says he cites it only to shew, 1. What was the most ancient way of baptizing. Which observation I turn directly against the English pædobaptists particularly. 2. ‘That the Christians of those times used the word *regeneration* for *baptism*.’ But this observation I have shewn to be false, 1. from the words themselves; and, 2. from other passages in St. Justin. But the third thing for which Mr. Wall cites this passage of St. Justin is, because he pretends ‘it shews they understood John iii. 5. of water-baptism, and concluded ‘from it that *none can be saved* without such baptism.’ Which however it is plain cannot be St. Justin’s meaning, for Mr. Wall himself allows St. Justin’s words relate only to adult persons, and not to infants.

In the next, which is the last citation from this Father, our author makes him say, some were disciplined to Christ, that is, as he



understands it, baptized *in their childhood*, even in the apostles' times. But this sense I have shewn to be violently and wrongfully imposed upon St. Justin, by a very false and unfair translation of his words.

VI. After this comes St. Irenæus, who is the first, as Mr. Wall allows, that makes express mention of infant-baptism; for he talks of 'infants, &c., being regenerated to God.' And this is generally thought an unanswerable instance. But I have fully shewn, First, that upon several accounts nothing can be more probable than that the passage, and all the latter part of the chapter, is spurious. 1. Because it contradicts the beginning of it. 2. It is asserted, St. John and other apostles taught a very gross falsehood. 3. St. Irenæus could not but know the Lord's age much more exactly than this part of the chapter makes him do: (1.) From the memorable things which attended his birth and sufferings. (2.) From his acquaintance with those who had conversed with the apostles. (3.) From the discourses then extant, to shew when the Messiah was to come and suffer. (4.) It appears even from St. Irenæus' own writings, that he could not believe Christ was near so old as this passage makes him, for he fixes the time of his birth, and could not but know the time of his death: 1. By the famous event of the destruction of Jerusalem: 2. From Phlegon, who wrote but a little before him: 3 From computing the years of the emperors according to their common reckonings; or particularly from Josephus. Secondly, this quotation is taken from a very corrupt translation only; as is proved, 1. By the authority of learned men; 2. By several instances wherein the translator appears to have changed, added to, or taken from, the sense of the original.

Besides this, I have shewn, that if the passage were genuine, and well translated, 1. It does not speak of baptism; and that it is not true to assert, as Mr. Wall does, that the ancients always by *regenerate*, &c. mean *baptized* nay, I have proved by many instances, that they never mean so; particularly that John iii. 5, and Titus iii. 5, cannot be so understood, and that St. Irenæus has not used the word so once in all his writings. 2. The place does not speak of infants in our common acceptation, of one or two years old, but comprehends all to ten years of age. From all which, I think, it necessarily follows, that nothing hitherto advanced by Mr. Wall can do the cause of pædobaptism any service.

VII. Next we come to Tertullian, who Mr. Wall says speaks of the necessity of baptism in such general terms as to reckon 'those

‘that die unbaptized as lost men.’ But I have shewn, he says as much of the *necessity of faith*, &c., and therefore this observation is no argument against us. And as to his express mention of infant-baptism, when he opposes it, that does not necessarily argue, as our adversaries would have it, that it was commonly practised at that time, only that some were endeavouring to introduce it. Again, Tertullian does not, as Mr. Wall pretends, simply advise to defer the baptism of children, but argues against it from their unfitness, &c., as a thing which ought not to be done. And in other places he speaks of baptism in such terms as are utterly inconsistent with paedobaptism.

As to Tertullian’s application of 1 Cor. vii. 14, I have observed, 1. His sense of it is far from favouring our antagonists. 2. Mr. Wall does not attempt to prove that Tertullian or any writer of the first three centuries understood the words to relate at all to baptism. Hence I take occasion to examine the pretences from St. Paul’s words, and to state the true sense of them. Here I observe, 1. That all Mr. Wall’s pains to prove *ἅγιος*, &c., mean *washed* or *baptized*, is to no purpose; for those words neither signify so here, or any where else. 2. That the most rational interpretation of the words is that which Mr. Wall so scornfully rejects, concerning legitimacy: which is proved, 1. Upon our author’s own principles. 2. From the design and context. 3. It is confirmed by the practice and ways of speaking among the Jews and Christians.

VIII. To these succeeds Origen, from whom, I confess, Mr. Wall cites some plain passages to his purpose: but their whole force is taken off by observing, 1. That they are not cited from his Greek remains, but only from the Latin translations. 2. That these are very bad, and made with the greatest license in the world, as appears both from the judgment of learned men, and from several instances. 3. That though Mr. Wall says the contrary, St. Hierome, by his own confession, was not more faithful than Ruffinus. 4. That the translators have not taken a liberty with what related to those opinions only of Origen which were then disputed, as Mr. Wall objects. 5. That Ruffinus, whatever Mr. Wall pretends, has dealt as unfairly with the Commentary on the Romans, from whence the principal citation is taken, as he was used to do with others. So that nothing can be inferred from any of those citations out of Origen.

Thus I have followed Mr. Wall for about two hundred and fifty years, and shewn, I think, beyond all contradiction, that there is not the least colour in any thing yet advanced for infant-baptism

within that period. St. Cyprian indeed, who comes next, and others after him, I acknowledge speak of it: but how far they allowed of it, or made it necessary, and in what cases &c., or how it came to be so universally received at last, it is not worth our while to inquire: for as the earliest times are much the most considerable and pure, what cannot be proved to have been taught or practised in them, we shall not be very forward to admit of now, barely upon the authority of the more corrupt centuries, when an infinite number of innovations and errors were introduced. It is enough for us that it cannot be proved Christ instituted this practice, or that the Scriptures justify it, or that for the first fifty years, or less, it was at all known: but since we are able to go so much further still, and have abundant ground to deny it was used till about two hundred years after Christ; and that, notwithstanding all the pains our adversaries have taken to prove the contrary, you see, sir, there is indeed nothing in whatever they advance which can in the least favour their opinion: can any thing be more just and necessary than that we continue to think and act as formerly? Doubtless all impartial judges must give sentence in our favour. And for these reasons it was, I think, altogether needless to follow Mr. Wall any further; and therefore I have neglected all the rest of his history. And indeed, there was no manner of necessity for his carrying his account so far. If he had only proved infant-baptism was practised in the first century, he might very well have spared the rest of his pains; for we should not then have disputed with him the practice of those who lived afterwards. But as matters stood, I must allow he was in the right of it, not to stop till he found infant-baptism fully settled; and therefore he runs on so far as St. Austin; for there is no author sooner who speaks so effectually to his purpose.

Before I conclude, sir, I must just take notice of one thing I remember you were used frequently to object, viz. That we are not able to assign the time when infant-baptism first commenced; and that it must seem mighty strange, and indeed improbable, to such as reflect upon the great piety and sincerity of the early centuries of the church, that an innovation of this nature should ever be in the least attempted; and much more that it should prevail so far, and be so generally owned and defended, and all so early as even we ourselves acknowledge it was. But, sir, I must beg you to consider,

1. That very many errors of as gross a kind were as soon started, and as generally received as the baptizing of infants: for the truth of this, I appeal to the Church histories, which abundantly make it

appear, and all learned men acknowledge it. Monsieur Jurieu has given a catalogue of divers of them in his eighth and some following pastoral letters for the year 1686 : and Monsieur du Pin has noted many alterations at the end of the first three and of the fourth centuries, in his Ecclesiastical History.

2. You are not to imagine this practice was established altogether, and at once, in as great a latitude as it is at present. It began, doubtless, at first, as all other innovations do, with only some little variations in opinions, and then passed to as little in practice ; and so, by very short steps, at length attained unobserved the great reputation it has now indeed for a long time enjoyed. And all this might be done in a very short time, as I have often observed to you it happened in the manner of administering this sacrament here in England : for dipping was wholly laid aside, and sprinkling used in its stead, in less than half a century, (even as our adversaries themselves still confess,) though directly contrary to Christ's direction, to a decree of a synod under Kenwolfe, the express words of the Service-book, and without any allowance, &c. ; and sure no alteration can be more bold than this is.

3. Lastly, that very piety and zeal you mention as a security against this innovation, in reality tended very much to betray them into it. It is true, it would hardly suffer them to lose any thing they had received, but it was not so inconsistent with their adding many things. And accordingly we see that from the very beginning it had this influence. Hence came the anointing the new-baptized, and giving them milk and honey to eat, &c., which are very early mentioned. It was the piety of the ancients that made them think and speak such high things of the sacramental supper, which by degrees brought them to speak of it as of a real sacrifice ; and then they were continually talking of offerings and altars, &c. Upon this, others soon began to understand those expressions literally, and to attribute much to the power of the priest's consecration, which easily led people to esteem the elements of a most holy nature after that ceremony : all which prepared them to understand our Lord's words, *This is my body*, in that very absurd sense many so strenuously plead for. And then the most pious dispositions, upon these mistakes, might well think the *mass* a meritorious and expiatory sacrifice, wherein the very body of Christ was not *offered up once for all*, but every day for the sins of the people : and all this must work them into the highest veneration for the transubstantiated wafer ; and no wonder if at length they ran into the idolatrous



adoration of it, and other fopperies, which naturally attend such extravagancies.

Much after the same manner infant-baptism seems plainly to have been introduced. They soon began to talk in very lofty hyperboles concerning the powerful effects and necessity of baptism: and at first indeed this was meant well enough; but as they did not foresee, so they did not very cautiously guard against future mistakes. The effects of it have been carried to that height, that it has been thought to save *ex opere operato*. And the necessity was very early improved so far as to be accounted absolute and indispensable: for several of the first Fathers do pretty plainly shew us, they thought that such as died without baptism could not be saved, or at least that their salvation was very doubtful. This indeed was at first meant only of such as had heard the word preached, as I have proved to you before; but afterwards came to be equally applied to all adult persons: and then, when from its being useful in order to salvation, they had brought it to be so indispensably necessary, especially to some, this prepared them to mistake our Lord's words, John iii. 5, which they began to think expressly asserted it was impossible for any of Adam's race to be saved without baptism: and upon this supposition no wonder if they were soon prevailed on, by their natural tenderness and affection, to secure the salvation of their beloved infants, which lie too near a parent's heart to be neglected in so weighty a point as that of their eternal felicity. And could it be made appear that this is the true sense of our Saviour's words, we should soon be brought to believe he intended infants should be baptized. It is not only probable that infant-baptism came in this way; but that this really was the case, must be plain enough to those who are acquainted with the writings of the Fathers. What I have said in several former letters proves it in some measure; and if I had thought it needful, I would have taken some pains to have done it professedly, and more at large. But particularly, nothing can be plainer than that the misunderstanding the sense of John iii. 5 gave rise to the error: for the Fathers who speak of it always deduce it from those words, and upon every pinch recur to them as their main retreat: and Mr. Wall confesses that they as well as himself looked upon this place as the chief ground of infant-baptism; and therefore it is pretty certain they had no better foundation for their practice, which most now see to be very sandy, and nothing but a mistake. So that this is not so hard as some fancy to be reconciled to the honesty and integrity of those pious men, who

were doubtless liable to mistakes as well as we. For thus in a case most exactly parallel, the same persons who introduced the baptizing of infants were equally for admitting them immediately after that to the other sacrament likewise, and that upon just such another mistake of our Saviour's words too: for as they inferred the necessity of baptism from John iii. 5, so they did also that of the eucharist from John vi. 53. Thus St. Austin, from these very texts, at the same time argues for baptizing and communicating infants<sup>t</sup>. And this custom of communicating infants accompanied the baptizing them, even from the first rise of pædobaptism, for several hundred years together, as in the Greek church it does to this day. All which is so true and manifest, as to be pretty generally acknowledged. Dr. Taylor somewhat largely proves it, and frequently says the one is altogether as well grounded as the other<sup>u</sup>; and indeed earnestly pleads for the continuance of both. But seeing the church has thought fit to disuse one, no man can shew a reason why the other may not as well be laid aside, since it is not built on a better foundation.

Now, sir, I think to lay down my pen: for I hope I have sufficiently proved to you, that we have abundant reason to persist in our opinion; and that Mr. Wall has not so effectually done our business as you at first believed. I recommend what I have said to your serious perusal: and give me leave to put you in mind, that it is very dangerous to make too free with our Saviour's positive institutions, for which you must expect to account in the last day. Let it therefore be your diligent care to judge impartially, having no other aim but to glorify God and obey his truth: to whom I commit you.

I am, &c.

<sup>t</sup> De Peccator. Merit. et Remission. lib. i. cap. 20.

<sup>u</sup> Worthy Communicant, cap. ii. sect. 2.

[See 'The Worthy Communicant,' by bishop Jeremy Taylor, 8°. 1674: or in the collection of his works.]



*A Table of the Texts of Scripture explained or cited in the  
foregoing Letters.*

GENESIS.	Page
i. 2. ....	242
ii. 24. ....	100
xi. 1. ....	223
xi. 9. ....	101
xxxv. 2. ....	235

EXODUS.	
xii. 22. ....	89
xiv. 21. ....	242
xv. 4. ....	92
xvii. 8, &c. ....	239
xix. 10. ....	234, 250
xix. 15. ....	235
xxix. 4. ....	101, 242
xxix. 36. ....	330
xxx. 18. ....	242
xxx. 21. ....	101

LEVITICUS.	
iv. 6. ....	89, 92
iv. 17. ....	89
vi. 27. ....	330
ix. 9. ....	89
xi. 31. ....	96
xi. 32. ....	89, 96, 98, 106, 114.
xi. 33. ....	96
xiv. 6. ....	89
xiv. 8. ....	237
xiv. 16. ....	89, 90
xiv. 23. ....	97
xiv. 51. ....	89, 90
xv. ....	98
xv. 5. ....	237
xv. 13. ....	ib.
xv. 16. ....	95
xx. 7. ....	236, 328
xxi. 23. ....	236
xxii. 6. ....	97, 98, 107

NUMBERS.	
vi. 9. ....	97
viii. 7. ....	98
xix. 7, 8. ....	95
xix. 9. ....	95, 96, 98
xix. 13. ....	131
xix. 18. ....	89, 95, 96, 98
xix. 19. ....	95, 96
xix. 21. ....	96
xxx. 19, 24. ....	235
xxx. 21, &c. ....	96
xxx. 23. ....	98, 330

DEUTERONOMY.	
xvii. 11. ....	221
xxxiii. 24. ....	89

JOSHUA.	Page
iii. 5. ....	235
iii. 15. ....	89
v. 2, &c. ....	285

JUDGES.	
vi. 38. ....	93

RUTH.	
ii. 14. ....	89

1 SAMUEL.	
xii. 2. ....	296
xiv. 27. ....	89
xvii. 49. ....	93
xxi. 4. ....	235

2 KINGS.	
iii. 11. ....	99, 101
v. ....	95
v. 14. ....	89, 95
viii. 15. ....	89

2 CHRONICLES.	
iv. 6. ....	101

NEHEMIAH.	
xiii. 23. ....	330

ESTHER.	
iii. 11. ....	223

JOB.	
ix. 31. ....	89
xxxi. 18. ....	296

PSALMS.	
xxxii. 6. ....	100
lxviii. 23. ....	89
lxxi. 5. ....	296
lxxi. 17. ....	ib.
xciv. 12. ....	201
cxxxiii. 3. ....	93

PROVERBS.	
xxviii. 21. ....	101

CANTICLES.	
vii. 2. ....	132

ISAIAH.	
i. 16, 17. ....	284
xxi. 4. ....	91

JEREMIAH. !	
iv. 4. ....	286
x. 2. ....	201
xi. 18. ....	224

EZEKIEL.	
xvi. 6. ....	211
xvi. 9. ....	ib.
xxii. 26. ....	328



DANIEL.	Page
iv. 23. ....	91
iv. 25. ....	92
iv. 33. ....	91, 96
v. 21. ....	92

## JUDITH.

xii. 7. ....	89
--------------	----

## ECCLESIASTICUS.

xxx. 26. ....	92
xxxiv. 26. ....	94, 97

## 2 MACCABEES.

i. 19. ....	94
i. 21. ....	ib.

## MATTHEW.

iii. 5, 6. ....	166, 213, 246
iii. 7. ....	226
iii. 8. ....	247
iv. 15. ....	230
v. 8. ....	262
v. 12. ....	5
vi. 9. ....	328
xi. 1. ....	201
xii. ....	127
xii. 2. ....	77
xii. 34. ....	226
xiii. 52. ....	185
xv. 6. ....	148
xv. 14. ....	226
xix. 5. ....	101
xix. 14. ....	275, 342
xx. 1. ....	296
xx. 22. ....	115
xxi. 31. ....	226
xxiii. ....	ib.
xxiii. 17. ....	330
xxiii. 19. ....	ib.
xxiii. 23. ....	111
xxv. 40. ....	57
xxvi. 23. ....	112, 117
xxvii. 57. ....	178, 179
xxviii. 19. ....	144, 146, 159, 177, 197, 198, 202, 206, 294, 339
xxviii. 20. ....	202

## MARK.

i. 4. ....	311
i. 5. ....	122
i. 8. ....	126
ii. 4. ....	66
vii. 3. ....	102
vii. 4. ....	103, 104
vii. 5. ....	99
vii. 8. ....	148, 226
viii. 26. ....	264
x. 14. ....	270
x. 15. ....	278
x. 17. ....	213
x. 20. ....	296
x. 37. ....	120
x. 38. ....	119
xi. 25. ....	264
xiv. 20. ....	117
xiv. 70. ....	230
xvi. 15. ....	197, 198, 206
xvi. 16. ....	268

## LUKE.

LUKE.	Page
iii. 7. ....	126
iii. 12. ....	ib.
iii. 16. ....	119
v. 4, 5. ....	66
xi. 38. ....	99, 104
xiii. 6, &c. ....	272
xiv. 26. ....	232
xvi. 24. ....	117
xxiv. 14. ....	300
xxiv. 21. ....	ib.
xxiv. 47. ....	189, 207

## JOHN.

i. 13. ....	270
iii. 3. ....	262
iii. 5. ....	11, 146, 204, 261, &c., 308, 342, 348, 349
iii. 6. ....	270, 308
iii. 7. ....	310
iii. 12. ....	ib.
iii. 18. ....	269
iii. 23. ....	87, 121
iv. 1. ....	188, 293
iv. 2. ....	293
vi. 45. ....	180
vi. 53. ....	12, 268, 349
viii. 31. ....	263
ix. 27. ....	193
xiii. 5. ....	101
xiii. 26. ....	117
xiii. 35. ....	7
xv. 22. ....	266
xx. 23. ....	148

## ACTS.

i. 5. ....	119
ii. 38. ....	294
vii. 51. ....	226
viii. 37. ....	206
viii. 38. ....	87, 122
ix. 25. ....	66
x. 42. ....	189, 207
xiii. 24. ....	311
xiv. 21. ....	206
xv. 10. ....	190
xvii. 30. ....	321
xviii. 23. ....	193
xix. 4. ....	247, 311
xxiv. 14. ....	4
xxv. 19. ....	229

## ROMANS.

ii. 1. ....	21
ii. 12. ....	266
ii. 28. ....	229
ii. 29. ....	267, 287
iii. 19. ....	266
iv. 15. ....	ib.
v. 9. ....	282
v. 10. ....	ib.
v. 11. ....	ib.
v. 14. ....	ib.
vi. 3, 4. ....	87, 123, 125, 133, 177
viii. init. ....	270
x. 14. ....	266
xii. 2. ....	308

ROMANS.	Page
xiv. 15. ....	50
xvi. 17. ....	37, 38

## I CORINTHIANS.

iv. 1. ....	4
iv. 15. ....	298
vii. 14. ....	132, 327, 345
viii. 9. ....	50
viii. 12, 13. ....	ib.
x. 2. ....	119
xi. 18. ....	38
xi. 28. ....	262, 264
xi. 34. ....	264
xv. 2, 3. ....	201

## 2 CORINTHIANS.

vi. 14, 15. ....	2
vi. 17. ....	38

## GALATIANS.

i. 8. ....	201
i. 9. ....	148, 201
iii. 27. ....	177
iii. 29. ....	229
iv. 19. ....	314
v. 1. ....	4
v. 6. ....	267
vi. 15. ....	267, 287, 310

## EPHESIANS.

iv. 5. ....	10, 55
iv. 22. ....	287

## COLOSSIANS.

ii. 11. ....	286, 343
--------------	----------

COLOSSIANS.	Page
ii. 12. ....	87, 123, 126, 286, 343
iii. 9, 10. ....	287, 308

## I TIMOTHY.

ii. 4. ....	324
iii. 2. ....	20
vi. 9. ....	82, 120
vi. 16. ....	263

## 2 TIMOTHY.

iii. 15. ....	295
---------------	-----

## TITUS.

iii. 5. ....	308, 311
--------------	----------

## HEBREWS.

ix. 10. ....	110, 211
ix. 19. ....	90
ix. 26. ....	33
x. 10. ....	ib.
x. 12. ....	ib.
x. 14. ....	ib.
x. 18. ....	ib.
xi. 6. ....	324
xii. 14. ....	ib.

## I PETER.

iii. 21. ....	266, 271, 326
---------------	---------------

## I JOHN.

iii. 9. ....	270
iv. 8. ....	14

## REVELATION.

xix. 13. ....	118
---------------	-----

*A Catalogue of the Authors cited and made use of in the foregoing  
Letters.*

A.

ÆLIANI Variæ Historiæ. Lugdun. Bata-  
vorum, 1701.  
Arati Phenomena. Basileæ, 1570.  
Aristophanis Comœdiæ. Lugdun. 1624.  
Aristotelis Opera. Aureliæ Allobrog. 1605.  
Arriani Commentar. de Epicteto. Londi-  
ni, 1670.  
Athenæi Deipnosophist.  
Augustini Opera. Colon. Agripp. 1616.

B.

S. Barnabæ Epistola Catholica, inter Pa-  
tres Apostolic. per Clericum. Antwerp.  
1700.  
Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici.  
Barthii Notæ ad Rutilii Itinerarium.  
Basilii Opera. Paris. 1618.  
Rab. Benjaminis Itinerarium.  
Beverigii Codex Canon. ad calcem Patr.  
Apostolic. per Cleric. Antwerp. 1700.  
—— Annotationes in Canones. ibid.  
Alberti Bobovii Turcarum Liturgia. Oxon.  
1690.  
Luce Brugensis Notæ ad Varias Lectio-  
nes Græc. N. T. in Bibl. Polyglott.  
Lond. 1657.  
—— In quatuor Evangelia. Antwerp.  
1606.  
Martini Buceri Enarrationes in quatuor  
Evangelia, Argentorat. 1530.  
Busbii Gram. Græc. Lond. 1689.  
Buxtorfii Lexicon Talmudicum. Basil.  
1639.  
—— De Abbreviaturis, &c. Franequer.  
1696.  
—— Synagoga Judaica.

C.

Callimachi Hymn. Ultrajecti, 1697.  
Cameronis Annotationes in N. T. inter  
Criticos Sacros. Francofurti, 1696.  
Cappelli Annotationes, inter Criticos Sa-  
cros. Francofurti.  
Casauboni Annotationes, inter Criticos  
Sacros.  
—— Exercitationes in Baronium.  
Cassiodor. Institut. Divin. Lect.  
Castelli Lexicon Heptaglott. Lond. 1669.  
Chrysostomi Opera.  
Ciceronis Opera. Lond. 1681.  
Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion,  
fol.  
Clementis Alexandrini Opera. Lutetia,  
1629.

Clementis Homiliæ, inter Patres Apostol.  
Antwerp. 1700.  
Clementis Roman. Epistola ad Corinth.  
inter Patres Apostol. Antwerp. 1700.  
Clerici Ars Critica, tom. 3. Amstel. 1700.  
—— Parrhasiana, Amsterd. 1701.  
—— Versio Gallica N. T. cum notis.  
Amsterd. 1703.  
—— Bibliothèque Choisie, tom. 13.  
Amsterd. 1707.  
Constantini Lexicon.  
Constitutiones Apostolicæ, inter Patres  
Apostolic. Antwerp. 1700.  
Cotelerii Notæ in Recognitiones. ibid.  
Cypriani Opera, Amstelodam. 1700.  
Cyrilli Hierosolymitani Opera.

D.

Daillé de Usu Patrum.  
Danetii Dictionarium Antiq. Rom. Græc.  
Paris. 1698.  
Diogenis Laertii Vitæ.  
Dionysii Halicarnassei Opera. Oxon.  
1704.  
—— Vita Homeri inter Opuscula My-  
thologica per Gale. Amsterd. 1688.  
Dionysii Episcop. Alexandrini Epistola ad  
Dionys. Presbyter. apud Euseb.  
Dodwell's Epistolary Discourse.  
—— Dissertationes Cyprianicæ, ad  
calcem Operum Cyprian. edit. Amstel.  
1700.  
Dodwell's Two Letters of Advice. Lond.  
1691.  
—— Dissertationes in Irenæum.  
Oxon. 1689.  
—— De Jure Laic. Sacerdot.  
Dorrington on Infant-baptism. Lond.  
1701.  
Drusii Annotationes in Nov. Test. inter  
Criticos. Francofurt. 1696.

E.

Edwards' Exercitationes. Lond. 1702.  
R. Eliezeris Pirké. Venetiis, 1544.  
Epiphani Opera.  
Episcopii Opera. Lond. 1678.  
Erasmii Annotationes in N. T. inter Criti-  
cos Sacros. Francofurt. 1696.  
Euripidis Tragœdiæ, per Barnesium.  
—— Scholiasta.  
Eusebii Hist. Ecclesiast. Lutet. Paris.  
1544.  
—— Vita Constantini, ibid.  
R. Ezechia Chaskuni. Venetiis, 1524.

## F.

Featly's Dipper Dipp'd. Lond. 1651.  
Feuarentii Notæ in Irenæum. Oxon.  
1702.

## G.

R. D. Ganz Tzemach David. Pragæ,  
1592.  
Glossarium Latino-Græcum, ad calcem  
Irenæi. Oxon. 1702.  
Grabe in Irenæum. Oxon. 1702.  
Gregorii Nazianzen. Opera. [fol. Paris.  
1630.]  
Gregorii Thaumaturgi Opera. Paris. 1622.  
Grotii Annotationes, inter Criticos Sacros.  
Francof. 1696.

## H.

Hammond's Annotations, Lond. 1659.  
—— Six Queries, Lond. 1653.  
—— Dissertationes de Episcop. Jure.  
Lond. 1651.  
Harpocration.  
Hegesippus apud Euseb. Paris. 1544.  
Heraclidis Pontici Allegoriæ Homeri, inter  
Opusc. Mythologica per Gale. Amsterd.  
1688.  
Hermæ Pastor, inter Patres Apostolic.  
per Cleric. Antwerp. 1700.  
Herodoti Historia per Stephan. 1570.  
Hesychius.  
Hyde Annotationes in Bobovii Turcar.  
Lit. Ox. 1690.  
Hieronymi Opera. Colon. Agrip. 1616.  
—— Versio Chronici Euseb. Amsterd.  
1658.  
—— De Locis Hebraicis.  
Hill de Presbyteratu. Lond. 1691.  
Homerus cum Eustathii Parecholis.  
Romæ.  
—— Cum Didymi Interpret. Basil.  
1535.  
—— Batrachomyomachia. Basil. 1582.  
Horatii Poemata. Lond. 1690.  
Huetii Origeniana, edit. cum Origenis  
Commentar. Græco-Lat. Colon. 1685.

## I.

Ignatii Epistolæ, inter Patres Apostolic.  
per Cleric. Antwerp. 1700.  
Josephi Opera. Genevæ, 1635.  
Irenæi Opera. Oxon. 1702.  
R. Isaac Chissuk Emunah. Altdorf. Noric.  
1681.  
Jurieu Lettres Pastorales.  
Justini Martyris Opera. Paris. 1636.  
Juvenalis Satyræ. Lond. 1669.

## L.

Lactantii Opera. Lugd. Bat. 1660. 8vo.  
Leti Ceremoniale. Amsterd. 1685.  
Lightfoot's Works. Lond. 1684.  
Limborchi Theologia Christiana. Am-  
sterd. 1700.  
Lipsius in Tacitum.  
Locke of Human Understanding. Lond.  
1700.

Lockmanni Fabulæ. Leid. 1615.  
Luciani Opera. Amstel. 1687.  
Ludolfi Lexicon Æthiopic. Lond. 1661.  
Lycophronis Alexandra. Oxon. 1697.  
Lysis Epistol. inter Opusc. Mythologica  
per Gale. Amsterd. 1688.

## M.

Maimonidis Porta Mosis. Oxon. 1655.  
Marcus Antoninus. Lond. 1697.  
MS. Nov. Test. Roberti Stephani.  
MS. N. T. Bezæ, Cantabrigiæ.  
—— Alexandrin.  
Midrasch Chumasch. Venetiis.  
Milton's Paradise Lost. Lond. 1675.  
Moschi Idyll. inter Poetas Minores,  
Lond. 1677.  
Munsteri Annotat. in Bibl. inter Criticos.  
Francofurti, 1696.

## N.

C. Nepotis Vitæ Imperatorum, &c. Lug-  
dun. 1684.  
Nicholson's Letter to Sir William Dug-  
dale, in Camden's Britannia. Lond.  
1695.  
Bishop Nicholson on the Catechism.  
Nizzachon Vetus. Altdorf. Noricor. 1681.

## O.

Ovidii Opera. Amstel. 1664.  
Origenis Commentar. Græc. Lat. Colon.  
1685.  
—— Contra Celsum. Cantabrig. 1677.  
—— Opera Latin. Basil. 1571.  
—— Philocalia, ad calcem lib. contra  
Celsum. Cantab. 1677.

## P.

Pearsonii Notæ in Cyprianum. Amsterd.  
1700.  
Perizonii Not. in Sanctii Minerv. Frane-  
quer. 1702.  
Petavii Dogmata Theolog. Antwerp. 1700.  
—— Animadversiones in Epiphan.  
—— Notæ in Themistium, Paris. 1618.  
Phavorinus.  
Pindari Olympia, &c. Oxon. 1697.  
—— Scholiasta.  
Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 1.  
Lond. 1692.  
—— vol. 3. Lond. 1698.

Platonis Opera. Francofurti. 1602.  
Plutarchi Opera, apud Stephan. 1572.  
Pocockii Notæ Miscellan. Oxon. 1655.  
Pollucis Onomasticon.  
Polycratis Epistola ad Victor. apud Eu-  
seb.  
Le Prieur Annotationes in Tertullian.  
Paris. 1675.

## R.

Recognitiones, inter Patres Apostol.  
Antwerp. 1700.  
Relandus de Religione Mohamed. Ultra-  
ject. 1705.  
Rigaltii Notæ in Tertullian. Paris. 1675.



Rigaltii Notæ in Cyprian. Amstel. 1700.  
Rushworth's Collections.

## S.

R. Salomonis Jarchi Comment. in Bibl.  
edit. per Buxtorf. in Bibl. Heb. et  
Chald. Basil. 1618.

Sanctii Minerva. Franequer. 1702.

Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the  
Thirty-Nine Articles. Lond. 1700.

Scaligerana. Colon. 1695.

R. Schem Tof Mizbeach Hazzahab. Basil.  
1602.

Senecæ Opera. Amsterd. 1634.

Socratis Scholastici Histor. Eccles. Paris.  
1544.

Sophoclis Tragoediæ.

Stennet's Answer to Russen. Lond. 1704.

Stephani Thesaurus Ling. Græc. 1572.

Strabonis Geographia. Amstel. 1707.

Suetonii Vitæ Cæsarum. Amstel. 1630.  
Suidas.

## T.

Taciti Historiarum Libb.

Talmud Babylonicum. Venetiis, 1520.

Targum Jonathan in Bibl. Polyglott.  
Lond. 1657.

—— Jerusalem, ibid.

—— Onkelos, ibid.

Tarini Notæ in Origenis Philocal. ad cal-  
cem libb. contra Celsum. Cantabrig.  
1677.

Taylor's Worthy Communicant.

Terentii Comœdiæ. Lond. 1700.

Tertulliani Opera. Paris. 1675.

Themistii Orationes. Paris. 1618.

Theocriti Idyll. inter Poet. Minor. Canta-  
brig. 1677.

Theodoreti Hist. Eccles. edit. cum Euseb.  
Paris. 1544.

Theophylacti Opera.

Theophili Antiocheni ad Autolyc. libb.  
ad calcem Justinii Martyris. Paris. 1636.  
Thucydides. Oxon. 1696.

Toldoth Jeschu. Altdorf. Noric. 1681.

Turretini Institutiones Theolog. Lugduni,  
1696.

## V.

Valesii Notæ in Eusebii Hist. Eccles.

Vatabli Annotationes, inter Criticos.  
Francofurti, 1696.

Versio Syriaca N. T. in Bibl. Polyglott.  
Lond. 1657.

—— Arabica, ibid.

—— Æthiopica, ibid.

—— Persica, ibid.

—— LXXviralis. Lond. 1653.

—— Hebraica. Paris. 1584.

—— Hebraica, per Hutterum.

—— Ariæ Montani, in Polyglott.

—— Vulgata, ibid.

—— Sixti V.

—— Bezae.

—— Erasmi.

—— Castalionis. Amsterd. 1683.

—— Italica.

—— Diodati.

—— Hispanica.

—— Gallica, Genevæ.

—— Gallica, Lugduni.

—— Belgica.

—— Danica.

—— Saxonica.

—— Græca Vulgaris.

Virgillii Opera. Lond. 1688.

—— by Dryden, 1709.

Vorstii Observationes in Tzemach David.  
Lugd. Bat. 1644.

Vossii Etymologicon. Amstel. 1695.

## W.

Wemmeri Lexicon Æthiopicum.

Whitby's Annotations, Lond. 1706.

A DEFENCE  
OF THE  
HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM  
AGAINST THE  
REFLECTIONS OF MR. GALE  
AND OTHERS.

BY WILLIAM WALL,

AUTHOR OF THE SAID HISTORY.



# A D E F E N C E

## OF THE

### HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

---

WHEN, after I had for some years made it my business to observe in my reading, and to collect such passages in the ancient Christian writers, as did any way relate to the baptizing of infants; I published them, with some notes of my own upon them, in the year 1705, being then about sixty years old; I little thought that the doing of that would bring me under a necessity of writing any more books, which is a fatigue unfit to be borne by one of my age. The *History* itself, or Collection of Quotations, could not, I thought, admit of any exceptions, provided I recited them true; which I was careful to do. And for my notes upon them, or any thing that related to the defence of the cause itself of infant-baptism, I thought, that if there arose any necessity of vindicating that, some younger and abler men would undertake it.

But the book having had more said and published, by some for and by some against it, than I could have expected; these latter who have wrote against it, and especially Mr. Gale's large book of 'Reflections,' (so he calls them: he might have entituled them 'Reproaches,') have made it needful (in the opinion of some worthy men, to whom I owe a deference) for me, even in this my weak and superannuated state<sup>a</sup>, to write something in vindication, partly of the cause, and partly of myself: some people having, it seems, raised a report or suspicion, as if I myself had altered my opinion about the duty or the ancient practice of baptizing infants.

<sup>a</sup> [This was written in the year 1720, at which time the author was seventy-five years of age.]



That honour which was publicly done to my book by those learned men of the lower house of convocation<sup>b</sup>, and by some others of great worth and station, as I ought ever humbly to acknowledge it to have been greater than I could deserve; and as it was in itself extraordinary; so it was a means of provoking the pen of somebody (I could never learn who it was<sup>c</sup>) presently to find faults in it. He in a Pamphlet, called 'An Account of the Proceedings in Convocation, 1705,' said, that I had therein reflected on a certain bishop, (and he spoke as if it had been a personal reflection on that bishop,) who, he said, was not a favourite of the lower house; but was, it seems, a favourite of the writer, and of the enemies of that house. But that being written not so much against me (who had only opposed a tenet of that bishop) as in anger and party-quarrel with them, and I having in the preface to the second edition answered what I thought needful, I have no more to say of that adversary's objections.

What I would do now is, partly to own what I myself, before I was attacked by antagonists, had, upon a longer consideration and review, thought to be blamable in it; and partly to answer the objections which some writers, and especially Mr. Gale, have made against it. I myself had reflected on some passages as blamable,

<sup>b</sup> [See the advertisement to this volume for the terms in which this compliment was conveyed.]

<sup>c</sup> [This is now generally understood to have been Dr. White Kennet, (afterwards bishop of Peterborough,) at that time archdeacon of Huntingdon: who, publishing 'An Account of Proceedings in the Convocation, which began Oct. 25, 1705, so far as it could be given, by reason of the concealment of the acts of the lower house, and the Prolocutor's refusal to transmit them to the proper office.' 4to. London, (no printer's name,) 1706,—at p. 58, makes the following remarks: 'Their [the lower house] peculiar pleasure was, to sit judges of books and sermons, to approve some and condemn others, as should seem meet unto them.'

'The book that had the honour of their express approbation was the treatise of *Infant-baptism* by Mr. George (sic) Wall. The sermon that was censured by them was that of Mr. Hoadly, preached before the lord mayor and aldermen of London, and published at their desire.'

'Without entering into the merit or demerit of either of these books, one can hardly forbear thinking, that the reason why one was commended was, because it contains several reflections on some

'of the bishops who are not favourites of the lower house: and that the other was censured, because it expresses a great zeal for the honour of the revolution, and no less concern for the present government, and the succession in the Protestant line. As to Mr. Wall's book, whatever commendation it may deserve, there doth not seem to be any other peculiar reason, why it should be singled out among so many excellent books as have been published within these few years; amongst which we may justly reckon those that have been published by Mr. Hoadly in defence of the established Church.'

It is well remembered, how much of division and of party-spirit appeared in that convocation; a portion of which may also be traced in the above remarks. Dr. Wall replied to them at length, in the preface to the second edition; but in that to his third he observes, 'To which (re-buke) I in the preface to the second edition gave what answer I thought needful. But that pamphlet being now, I suppose, out of print and forgotten, I do not think my answer to it worth re-printing.'

The passage objected to had occurred in part ii. chap. 5. sect. 9, of the first edition.]

(and happy is that writer who, upon a sedate review of what he has said, has not occasion so to do,) and particularly such, wherein animadverting on some mistakes or misrepresentations of things, made by some authors, I had used a strain of language more censorious or satirical than should have been used toward men, who had been otherwise of great merit and worth.

When any one of great learning, judgment, and piety, has by the use of those good qualities, and by great pains and study, done considerable service to religion and the Church of God, (which is the case of the learned Grotius,) such a man is, even in the mention of his faults, (when the defence of any truth makes it necessary to mention them,) and in the confutation of his mistakes, to be treated with respect. He in his comment on Matt. xxviii. 19, set himself to establish a doctrine which is perfectly new, of the indifferency (*libertas* he calls it) of baptizing or not baptizing infants. And to that purpose heaped together several reasons and authorities, which, as he uses them, do make for the Antipædobaptists' side of the question, that they might balance those which he knew were for the other side. The producing any of these testimonies that were true, and could fairly be applied to the purpose for which he used them, is a thing which I of all men must not have blamed him for: for it was that which I pretended to do myself. But he brings some, which, I think, I have shewn to be not so. As, not to mention his saying, 'that St. Austin, before he was heated with the Pelagian disputes, never wrote any thing of the condemnation of unbaptized infants, not even to those lesser pains in the world to come;' which I have shewn from St. Austin's own words to be otherwise, part i. chap. xv. sect. 3 and 5; nor his finding an argument against infant-baptism in the council of Neocæsarea, Can. 6, which, when duly considered, has nothing *pro* or *contra* about it; nor his quoting some words of Balsamon's comment on that canon, which might represent him as understanding it against infant-baptism, and leaving out other words in the same paragraph, which would have plainly discovered the mistake of such a representation; nor his saying, that in the Greek churches many persons, 'from the beginning to this day, have the custom of delaying the baptism of infants, till they are able to make profession of their faith;' which account of the modern practice is certainly wrong, and of the ancient practice (which is the thing disputed) he brings no tolerable proofs; nor his saying, that 'in the councils one shall find no earlier mention of pædobaptism than in the council of Carthage, anno 418;' whereas the council under St. Cyprian, that speaks of it as absolutely

necessary, was nigh two hundred years before; he makes the most palpable mistake of all, in representing Gregory Nazianzen as speaking of infancy as a state incapable of baptism, in a sentence where Gregory only speaks of the mishap of those infants, who being διὰ νηπιότητα, *by reason of their infancy*, incapable of procuring it to themselves, have no friends that will procure it for them: which children, as he judges, will by that means miss of heaven. Which is just as good arguing, as if from the history of the impotent man, John v, who for thirty-eight years had been unable himself to get into the pool time enough for cure, and had nobody to help him into it, one should conclude, that impotency is a reason why a man should not, or ought not to be cured.

This last mentioned perverting of the plain meaning of Gregory's words to a directly contrary sense, I called *a foul imposture*<sup>d</sup>. What I blame myself for is, that the consideration of the merit of so great a man, shewn in the other places of his comments, did not prevail with me to use expressions of more deference and a more modest censure; though of the incongruity of the argument, my thoughts be as they were then.

I had occasion to recite a discourse of St. Chrysostom's, which I thought, and do think still, to be manifestly inconclusive; but expressed the censure of it in words which shewed too plainly that I did not consider who he was, and who I am<sup>e</sup>. These words were, upon the admonition of a superior, (who had a large catalogue of such my faults presented to him by some, who upon application refused to let me see it,) amended in the second edition.

Several other learned men, (it would be too long to name all the cases,) upon whose opinions or quotations my subject led me to make animadversions, did deserve to have been treated more respectfully.

The dispute that had of late been raised about the tenets of the Waldenses concerning infant-baptism, led me into a short history of those people; which, I understand since, had been much more distinctly and skilfully handled by others<sup>f</sup>. I did not sufficiently distinguish between the Waldenses properly so called, and the Albigenses. The Petrobrusians, whom I mentioned<sup>g</sup> (and I think they were so) as the first antipædobaptists, were of the Albigenses. None of the Waldenses, I think, did deny infant-baptism.

What I said of St. Ambrose<sup>h</sup>, affirming that John the Baptist baptized infants, should have been expressed not so positively. The

<sup>d</sup> [Part ii. chap. 2. sect. 9, in the first and second editions.]

<sup>e</sup> [Part i. chap. 14. sect. 1.]

<sup>f</sup> [See some account of writers who

have treated on the history of these people, in a note at vol. i. p. 484.]

<sup>g</sup> [Part ii. chap. 7. sect. 5.]

<sup>h</sup> [Part i. chap. 13. sect. 1.]



tenor of the quotation which I brought from his comment on Luke i. does (I think still) lead to that sense of his words. But it is better for a quoter, where the phrases have any ambiguity, to intimate what he takes to be the most obvious sense of them, and leave the more positive judgment of them to the reader. He that would pass a judgment would do well to read all that he says there of the parallel between John and Elias.

These, and some more such reflections on some particular passages of my own book, I had made, before I was attacked by any adversary ; and had drawn up a breviary of them for my own use, and shewed it to some friends, and they to others. One of which having seen it said, where I have heard of it again, that he had seen a *recantation* of my book under my own hand. And this perhaps might give occasion to a report, which some have heard, that my opinion concerning pædobaptism was altered. I must not use again any such sharp language as I am now blaming myself for ; (for this also is a man of worth ;) but I wish him a better use of his faculty of distinguishing between a *review*, wherein any one acknowledges the faultiness of some particular expressions, as being too censorious, too positive, &c., and a *recantation* of a book, a doctrine, or a history. St. Austin wrote his *retractations* of the former sort, but not of the latter ; neither did I.

Of those who have written against me, I do not take Mr. Bernard<sup>i</sup> of Holland to be one. On the contrary, I account it an honour done to me, that he thought my book one of those that it was worth his while to give an abstract of in his ‘*Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*’ for the year 1708. But yet (as I think it always happens between writers) he thinks it necessary to differ from me in some things, and to give his censure of some passages ; but of none in my first part, as I remember, that are of moment, save that on reading the hard words, which I mentioned just now, on Grotius, he says, p. 383, ‘Possibly Grotius might, without any design of ‘*imposture*, cite that passage of Gregory Nazianzen, writing in too ‘*much haste or heedlessness*,’ ‘*avec trop de précipitation*.’ And I am content it should go so.

But he finds more faults in the second part. Upon my giving my opinion, chap. x, that that one example of Gregory, the father of Gregory Nazianzen, letting his son, born to him after his own

<sup>i</sup> [See the periodical literary review published by M. Jacques Bernard, under the title of *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 12mo. Amsterdam, 1699, &c. In

October 1708 this contained a review of Dr. Wall's *first* part, and in Nov. of the same year one of the *second* part of his *first* edition, 1705.]



baptism, grow up unbaptized, (which is the only instance that can be brought, and that not plainly to be proved,) ought not to be accounted of any great weight, for reasons there given; he, at p. 568, is of another opinion, 'That my reasoning at that place is not solid, but warped. That this example shews, that at that time they did not take the baptizing of infants to be a law indispensable, since a priest was suffered to let his child go unbaptized.' Now it seems to me no very solid conclusion, which he would draw from this one instance of a man, who is represented by the writers of his son's life, (who are the only writers that mention him,) to have been of little judgment or capacity, against all the examples and advices of the other ancient Christians, especially when of fourteen instances, which some antipædobaptists had endeavoured to obtrude, of the children of Christians baptized at their adult age, I had, as he saw, there shewed the other thirteen to be mistakes in history; and indeed I question whether Mr. Bernard and others should not rather blame me for too much easiness in yielding this one, viz. that Gregory Nazianzen was born after the year 325, which was the year of his father's conversion from heathenism to Christianity. It was only one sentence, and one word in that sentence, (in the writing whereof there may possibly have been an error,) that made me yield up all those many proofs and reasons in chronology to the contrary. For Suidas<sup>k</sup> makes him to be born twenty-five years before; and so does Papebrochius<sup>l</sup>, and so does Mr. Pagi<sup>m</sup>, and Mr. Le Clerc. And Baronius<sup>n</sup> himself sets his birth three years before. By any of these accounts, the wonder that he was not baptized in infancy will cease. The word that puzzles all is *θυσιῶν*, in that sentence, where the father says to the son, 'You have not lived so many years in all as are the years of my sacrificing;' by which must be meant, (if that word be allowed,) 'of my officiating as a Christian priest.' Which will make the son (who is often spoken of by himself, by the writers of his life, and by others, as one that lived to a very great age) to have lived no longer than sixty-one or sixty-two. For he died in 389. And there must be some time supposed to have passed between his father's conversion, which was 325, and his ordination. Papebrochius thinks, that instead of *διηλθε θυσιῶν*, it was *διηλθ' ἐτησίῳν*. Which will make the father say to the son, 'You are not so old as I.' I should rather think

<sup>k</sup> [In voce 'Gregorius.'

<sup>l</sup> [See the *Acta Sanctorum*, volume the second, for May, at the ninth day, page 369, &c. &c.]

<sup>m</sup> [In his '*Critica in Annales Card.*

*Baronii*,' at the year 354, No. xi. tom. i. p. 481. fol. Colon. Allobr. 1705.]

<sup>n</sup> [See '*Baronii Annales*,' at the year 340, No. xxxvi: and 324, No. xxiii, &c.]

(if we may venture to amend) that *θυσιῶν* has been written instead of *πολιῶν*, (or for the verse sake *τῶν πολιῶν*,) which will make him say, 'You are not so old as my grey hairs are;' or, have not lived so long as I have been grey-headed. The objection against this amendment, which arises from the construction of the verse, is not considerable in this case, because Gregory in that poem does commonly put an anapæstus for the fourth foot of his iambic. That is certainly the scope of the place. For the father there entreats the son's assistance in his weakness and extreme old age. And the father is by the history known to have been old before the son was born. I have since that time lighted on one proof more, that the son must be considerably older than sixty-one when he died. For St. Hierome mentioning him, (*de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*,) calls him one of his *masters*, by whom he had in his younger years been instructed in the study of divinity. Whereas by this account St. Hierome was within four years as old as he. For at 389 he was fifty-seven, as is easily computed by the history of his life.

Mr. Bernard here adds, that he is 'convinced that infants are to be baptized.' But he does not think baptism to be 'of absolute necessity;' nor that it is this sacrament 'which makes us true (or proper, *veritable*) Christians.' This is wonderful cautious. As to the necessity; we should, methinks, account all our Saviour's commands to be necessary. And I had quoted to him Calvin's acknowledgment; 'We do confess the use of baptism to be *necessary*; that it is not lawful to omit it by negligence or contempt. We do not count it free, (or *indifferent*,) and we do not only strictly oblige Christians to the use of it, but do affirm it to be the *ordinary instrument* of God to wash and renew us, and to communicate to us salvation. This only we except; that God's hand is not so tied to the instrument, but that it can of itself effect our salvation. For where there is no possibility of baptism, God's promise alone is abundantly sufficient.' Antidot. ad Synod. Trident. Sess. 7, de Baptismo. Here it is owned to be necessary, not only *necessitate præcepti*, but also *necessitate medii*, in God's ordinary way.

But they will not have it said that we are 'made Christians' by it; yet Calvin here says, it is 'the ordinary instrument of God to communicate to us salvation.' And it may, one would think, be as well owned to be the ordinary instrument of God to 'make us Christians;' and that this is a fitter theological expression, than that which I quoted of a new-fashioned English divine; 'We are born members of the Christian church.' Which is the direct contrary to the maxim of the ancient Christians; 'Christiani non nascimur, sed fimus.' Calvin

says, Instit. lib. iv. cap. 15: ‘The children of the faithful are not ‘baptized for that reason, that they may then first be made ‘children of God, &c. But rather they are therefore received by ‘that solemn sign into the church, because they did before belong ‘to the body of Christ, by virtue of the promise.’ The Church of England, in the Catechism, makes the catechumen say, ‘In my ‘baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God,’ &c. A like dispute might be raised about the efficacy of sealing a deed of land. One may say, it is the sealing that conveys the right to the land; another, it is not that, but the will of the donor. Both will agree, that it is not the parchment, wax, &c., but the will of the donor solemnly signified by those tokens. Bishop Stillingfleet does well observe, in the place I there quoted, (Unreasonableness of Separation, part iii. sect. 36,) that the Church of England by requiring sponsors ‘does not exclude any title to baptism, which ‘the child has by the right of the parents.’ But he shews at the same place, that if the parents be supposed to have no right, yet upon the sponson of godfathers, the church has right to administer baptism to infants (which Mr. Bernard, as we shall see presently, owns to be the sense of other protestant churches); and that those who think themselves bound to baptize children *only* by virtue of their parents’ right, will run into many perplexing scruples, of which Mr. Bernard will give me occasion to speak by and by.

As for the assurance which they express, that where baptism cannot be had, God will in mercy make up the defect, and take the sincere will of the parent for the deed; no protestant, that I know of, will dispute against them, but have hopes of the same. But this is by extraordinary mercy, and should have no effect to alter the offices of the church visible; which cannot properly (in an office for burial, or any other occasion) call a person one of her members, till he has been regularly received as such, by the ordinary way of God’s appointment.

At p. 443, &c., where I had said, that all the ancient Christians (without the exception of one man) do understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, to mean baptism; and that I believed Calvin to be the first man that ever denied it so to be meant: Mr. Bernard, not willing to let Calvin’s name pass without pleading something for him, makes this reflection; ‘It must nevertheless be owned, that ‘there are considerable difficulties in this explication of that passage ‘given by the ancients, and which our author takes to be the true ‘one. It is hard for any one to think, that none of all this discourse ‘of Jesus Christ to Nicodemus is to be understood of the true (or



‘ proper, *veritable*) regeneration : which baptism cannot confer of itself, at least, unless one would say, that all infants that are baptized are actually regenerate.’

Mr. Bernard seems here not to have a right conception of the meaning of these ancient Christians. They did not think that the outward part of baptism was all that Jesus Christ understood or meant by this discourse ; but that he comprehended in these words, *born of water, and of the Spirit*, both the outward part, the water, &c., and also the inward part, that operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the baptized person is, by God’s mercy, and his gracious covenant, received into a new spiritual state, translated out of the state of nature (to which a curse is due) into the state of grace and mercy in Jesus Christ : or (as Calvin’s words are) *renewed* and brought to a *state of salvation*. St. Austin, in the words which I cited, part i. ch. xv. sect. 5. § 9, shews how he and the ancients understood the regeneration or new birth of an infant in baptism, as meant by our Saviour, in the plainest words possible : ‘ Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ, et Spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ,’ &c. These taken together, he means, do regenerate the infant. And is not this a happy and desirable regeneration for the infant ? Is not the spiritual state of the child by this merciful method of God’s appointment so altered for the better, that he may well be said to be born anew, and entered into a new state ? When he was by nature born in sin, in a state of spiritual pollution, subject to God’s wrath, &c., are not the pardon of that sin or pollution, the release of the old bond, the admittance into a new covenant, the adoption into God’s family, to be partaker of Christ’s purchase, &c., sufficient to denominate a *veritable regeneration* ?

But Mr. Bernard says, ‘ Baptism cannot confer this of itself.’ Not the water of itself, for certain. But the water, and the grace or mercy of God, applied to the person by the Holy Spirit (whose good offices Christ has promised shall accompany his ordinances) can.

But then it will follow, he says, that ‘ all baptized infants are ‘ actually regenerate.’

In this sense of the word (*entered into a new spiritual state*, which is the old sense of it) they are ; and they have consigned to them the promises of such assistances of God’s Spirit as they shall from time to time be capable of. And in that state they continue for ever, if they themselves do not by actual wickedness break, forfeit,



and disannul the gracious covenant into which they are then entered.

Mr. Bernard argues, that if our Saviour had meant no more than this, 'that would have been to no purpose, which he speaks of the 'action of the *Spirit* upon the *heart* of those who are regenerated, 'and which he compares to *the wind*,' &c.

That grace of the Spirit, which we have mentioned, is given both in the case of the adult, and also of infants. There are some other graces of the same Spirit, which are given peculiarly to the adult in their baptism; as a present converting the heart, enlightening the mind, comforting the soul, &c. When we maintain, that this discourse of our Saviour concerning baptism, and the regeneration of the person, is applicable to infants, we do not think that it relates to them only. On the contrary, in this and most other texts, where our Saviour or the Apostles do speak of baptism, though their words do comprehend and reach to the case of infants, yet they seem to have a more especial eye to the case of the adult persons of that time. Inasmuch as (though both were to be done) the baptizing of the adult, and the converting and fitting them for it, was the first and chief thing which the Apostles had at that time to do. Now our Saviour's general words (*born of water and of the Spirit*) do comprehend both these gracious effects of God's Spirit, adapted to the several subjects according to their respective capacities.

And whereas Mr. Bernard brings in, as an objection against this, those other words of our Saviour there; *That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*: St. Austin's explication of that place, which I recited, is natural and plain; as it is applied by him to infants (as well as adult persons) baptized: for infants are born in a state of corruption and guilt, (which is called *born of the flesh*;) but in baptism *born again by the Spirit* to a state of grace, and favour, and blessing. Unless Mr. Bernard will deny, that the Spirit of God, beside his office of converting the heart in the adult, does also, in the case of baptized infants, apply to them the pardon of original sin, the favour of being received into the Christian covenant, consigning to them such grace as shall assist them as they come to years, &c. Which I shewed (in this very chapter on which we are treating) that the antipædobaptists themselves do allow to be done in the case of all infants, baptized or not, which, dying in infancy, are saved. And no Christian, I think, will venture to say, that any infant can go

to heaven without this application of the merits of Christ to him.

Therefore that which Mr. Bernard says next, ‘The authority of the Fathers of the Church is of no force against an explication founded upon what goes before, and what follows, in the context, and upon the rules of the best critics,’ raises no objection against this explication of the Fathers, which is agreeable to the words, both of the text and context. On the contrary, I am glad to hear him say this; for if no such privilege be to be allowed to the Fathers, it will follow *à fortiori*, that much less is the authority of one man, Calvin, (though he be for the general, a good expositor,) of force against an explication of this text, which is both natural in itself, and was ever accounted so by all Christians, without exception, for fourteen or fifteen hundred years, and is accounted so still by most Christians. And I think, the disdain with which all Christians do receive that explication of the Quakers, whereby they evade the force of such texts as concern the other sacrament, and do by the words, *bread, wine, eating, drinking, &c.*, force themselves to mean some other mystical thing,—should make one have the less regard to Calvin’s way of interpreting this text, which is so very like it, who will have no material *water* to be meant in this text; as they, no material *bread* in the other. For the Apostle’s words, *The Bread which we break is the Communion of the body of Christ, &c.*, do not more plainly express the external, as well as internal part of that sacrament, than our Saviour’s words, *born of water and of the Spirit*, do of this. Especially if they be compared with other like texts, as Tit. iii. 5, *The washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit, &c.* To say, that these do not mean baptism, is as great a paradox as to say, that the other do not mean the Lord’s Supper. And at this rate of altering words, or expounding away the plain sense of them, any texts of Scripture whatever may be eluded.

Mr. Bernard grants, however, that ‘our Saviour does in these words make an *allusion* to baptism; to that baptism with water which had been in use among the Jews, and which John Baptist administered to the Jews themselves.’

But surely, our Saviour’s affirming in so solemn a manner, *Verily, verily, &c.*, that without it, none shall enter into the kingdom of God; should be taken for more than an *allusion*.

He adds, that ‘Jesus Christ did mean nevertheless, the *proper* regeneration, which consists in the conversion of the heart.’

The question here between him and us is, whether no regeneration, which is not accompanied with present actual conversion of

the heart, can be called *proper* regeneration? I think it may be solved thus: As the command of circumcision, which was given in general, (both to infants, and to such adult persons as had not yet received it,) carried with it an injunction of present actual circumcision *of the heart* to the adult receiver of it, but not to the infant receiver, and yet was *proper* circumcision to both of them; so baptism carries along with it a present actual *conversion of heart* in the adult receiver, but not in the infant receiver; and yet is *proper regeneration* to both of them. If Calvin and some late writers will give the name of *proper*, or *veritable*, only to that to which they (without the consent of antiquity or the greatest part of Christians) have appropriated the word, it is but a dispute of words.

At p. 575, he asks, ‘Whether I, who would have men have so great respect for the Fathers, can shew any plain place of Scripture which may support that opinion, concerning *a middle state*, (in which unbaptized infants will be,) which I had shewn to be held by some of them?’

Now I never pretended to that, nor to give any determination at all to that question; but shewed it to be a thing in which half the Church was of one opinion, (viz. the Greek church,) and half of the other. Only I gave a reason from what our Saviour says, Luke xii. 48, that if they do miss of heaven, and be under some degree of condemnation; it is to be hoped, that it will be (as St. Austin says) a very gentle one.

At p. 580, Mr. Bernard is more angry with me. I had said, part ii. chap. 6. sect. 10, that some modern Calvinists would establish a rule (which I there shewed to be contrary to the practice of the Christians) in the baptizing of children; that none are to be baptized but the children of parents actually godly and religious: and that Bishop Stillingfleet had fully shewn the absurdity and inconsistency of this opinion; and how they can never, in many cases that may be put, come to a resolution, what children they may baptize, and what not. For which I quoted his ‘Unreasonableness of Separation,’ part iii. sect. 36.

Mr. Bernard says, ‘He will not stand to recite that part of the chapter, because it will be difficult to do it without angering (choking<sup>o</sup>) me, who do set out as absurd the doctrine of some whom I call *Calvinists*: and that he would not be exposed to the temptation of returning injury for injury (or reproach). That he believes I do not understand their tenet. That they do not refuse baptism to *all* the children even of infidels. They give it to all

<sup>o</sup> [Sans choquer, peut-être, l’auteur.]

‘ such as the parents do abandon, or whose education they will leave to Christians. That in Holland they baptize infants found in the streets, though there may be among them some born of Jewish or Mahometan parents.’

If Mr. Bernard had read the discourse of Bishop Stillingfleet which I there cite, he would have seen that the Bishop there speaks only of some separatists in our nation, who do make that one part of their quarrel with our church, the giving baptism to the children of ungodly parents, (which yet our church does not without sufficient sponsions,) and that he does not meddle with the practice of any foreign churches. Neither did I mean any thing of what I said there in reference to them; but only to those who trouble our people here by their unchristian schisms and cavils; seeking about for any handle to draw the people from our communion, and using this for one: for which, as it seems, the foreign churches give them no occasion or encouragement. For if those churches which Mr. Bernard speaks of do as he says, I do not see but that they do as the ancients did, and as the church of England does. For neither they nor we would baptize any children of infidels, but such as some Christian had the power or possession of, and did promise for their Christian education or instruction. So that, things being rightly understood, here was no occasion of choking either him or me or the Bishop, if living.

P. 585. Whereas I had noted (or rather had cited Mr. Russen as noting) the way of the English antipædobaptists receiving the sacrament (which he affirms to be) sitting at a common table, and handing the elements one to another, as shewing (outwardly at least) less devotion than most other Christians shew; Mr. Bernard says, ‘ It is certain this is the most ancient manner of receiving that sacrament; for it was so that Jesus Christ celebrated it with his apostles.’ He should have taken notice, that it was not at a common table, but in an *ὑπερῶν*, such as learned men have proved that the Jews and ancient Christians did set apart for holy uses. Nor did the apostles hand it to one another, but Christ gave it to them.

He says, ‘ As this way of receiving is generally enough used in Holland, Mr. Wall certainly will not blame me for my reflection.’ I am easy; provided he will not blame me for applying the words of Christ, John iii. 5, to baptism; which the church of England (as well as the ancient church) does in her office for baptism so apply; nor for saying, that an infant, when baptized, is *regenerate*, which she says in the same office. Nor for my reflection on his saying, that ‘ it is not the sacrament of baptism which makes us Christians.’



For she does in the Catechism (besides what I cited before) say ; that ‘ we being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, ‘ are hereby (by baptism) made the children of grace.’ And one of the Thirty-nine Articles of our church is, that ‘ by it, as by an ‘ instrument, they that receive it rightly are grafted into the ‘ church.’ And so say all the ancient Christians whom I cited. Particularly St. Chrysostom : Οὐδεὶς δὲ υἱὸς βαπτίσματος ἂν κληθεῖη *χωρίς*ρ.

He says farther, that ‘ he does not know what the churches of ‘ Holland have done to me. But it appears by some places of my ‘ book that I am not very much their friend.’ This is said with respect to a passage a little before in the same chapter, viz. part ii. chap. 8. sect. 5.

And forasmuch as others, beside Mr. Bernard, have animadverted on that passage, I will set it down here at large, as it was in the first edition, which Mr. Bernard had, (for in the second it is somewhat shortened,) that I may know the sentiments of the rest of my friends, how far I was blamable in it. I had spoke of the Mennonites, or Minnists in Holland, how apt they are to divide from one another. And then added :

‘ The worst is, that not only the Minnists, but the Holland ‘ people generally, have the humour to run into divisions and ‘ schisms in religion upon almost any difference of opinion. There ‘ is not the like of them again in the world for this temper. ‘ Whereas the great aim and interest of religion is, unity and communion in the worship of God, notwithstanding different sentiments in points not fundamental ; and schisms and parties are ‘ forbidden, as courses that will certainly ruin it ; there is no sin ‘ that these people think to be a less sin than schism is. They are ‘ generally of a temper that is commendable in many other qualities ; but for this matter they are the subject of the mockery of the ‘ papists, and the grief and shame of the protestants. How far the ‘ ministers there do their duty, in shewing the people the sinfulness ‘ of schism, I know not. Some do think, that a country so disposed ‘ as that, let what stranger will come thither, and bring with him ‘ any odd and singular opinion whatsoever, he shall find there a ‘ church perfectly fitted to his humour, has thereby a great ‘ advantage for alluring a concourse of men, and promoting trade. ‘ If this be allowed, I am afraid it is to little purpose to preach ‘ there against the sin of schism. And perhaps the ministers dare ‘ not do it.’

And in another chapter, chap. 11. sect. 2, speaking of the same thing, viz. of the temper of some Christians to set up a several church for every several opinion, I subjoined,

‘ This one may call the Holland way of Christianity. Not that the States of that country do, I suppose, approve of this as best, or would have it so. But many people there fell into that way. And they have been imitated by another nation, and, as some do now say, outdone in it. However that be, it is the most contrary to the nature and design of Christianity, of any thing that could be devised. For Christ, as he is but one head, never designed to have any more but one body,’ &c.

The late archbishop of Canterbury told me, that a statesman of England had said to him concerning these passages of mine, ‘ How comes a minister to meddle with the affairs of our allies?’ He did not tell me who it was. And though I could guess, yet I will not. Meddling in state-matters, I know, is dangerous; but preaching against schism is preaching a Christian doctrine. Against such a manifest wickedness, and so condemned by God’s word, as divisions in religion are, I humbly hope *a minister* may preach or write; and that, whether it be our own country, or a neighbour nation, in which they are rife. Especially if the example of that neighbour nation does, as I said, infect and spread among our people; and the state of religion among us be the worse for our imitating them in matters of religion.

What Mr. Bernard remarks on these passages is at his 592nd page. To shew that they do denounce to the people the sinfulness of schism, he says, that ‘ in the liturgy of the Lord’s Supper, which is in use in the Walloon churches, and is the same with that of the French church, they do excommunicate by name all that make sects, and break the unity of the church.’ I hope then that the people will mind this, and that the ministers there will apply their warnings to those whom they think in the fault, that they do not live and die in a state of soul subject to excommunication.

If it will be any satisfaction to Mr. Bernard to have us be as free and ready to acknowledge our own blemishes, faults, and misfortunes, as we are to speak of those of other churches and nations; we must, I think, with sorrow and shame confess, that since this time of his and my writing, there have been published in *England* more rank principles of schism than ever were in *Holland*; and that, not in any conventicle, but openly, avowedly, in the face of the world; and in such circumstances as that our main hope left under God is, that the people themselves, even those that were otherwise inclined

to separations, will see and consider the mischievous and destructive consequences of them; (destructive not only of that general unity which should be in the universal church, or any national church; but even of the unity, society, order, government, or authority of any church or Christian society at all;) and will start back from such an unskilful proposal as would dissipate the members, and dissolve the communion, not only of any established church, but of any congregation of ten or fewer Christians.

Upon the whole, I take Mr. Bernard's remarks on my book to be such as become a learned, and also a civil and friendly writer. As for the difference of opinion concerning some points of less moment in religion, it will always happen. And as a part of my book was to shew that they ought not to break communion, so neither ought they to hinder friendship; especially when each does labour to defend and maintain the tenets and customs of that part of the church, or of that nation, whereof he is by Providence a member. A moderate degree of zeal in such a case is commendable, and a little excess of it pardonable: much more pardonable than in the case of those, who spend their zeal in opposing and quarrelling with the usages, tenets, and ceremonies of their own church and nation.

In the year 1709 came out a pamphlet with a mock-title: 'Mr. Wall's History of Infant-Baptism Improved<sup>q</sup>.' The author, Mr. Emlyn<sup>r</sup>, thought that from one paragraph in my introduction (wherein I observed, that the Jews, who gave baptism to proselytes and their infants, did not use it for themselves, nor for their own children) he might gain some advantage to that which is his and some other Socinians' opinion; that Christians might do likewise, i.e. give baptism to such as are newly converted from heathenism,

<sup>q</sup> [I have not been able to meet with Mr. Emlyn's pamphlet, in this its *first* shape, as described by Dr. Wall. It appears that the author remodelled his piece, which was afterwards published in the 'Collection of Tracts by Thomas Emlyn,' 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1731, under the title of 'The previous Question to the several questions about valid and invalid Baptism, Lay Baptism, &c., considered.' vol. ii. p. 315—345. It was reprinted, with the addition of some few notes, and a letter in answer to objections, in Emlyn's works, 3 vols. 8vo. 1746; vol. i. p. 391—428. The passages quoted by Dr. Wall do not occur in the tract as given in those volumes.]

<sup>r</sup> The full title of this piece is, 'Mr. Wall's History of Infant-baptism im-

'prov'd: or a just occasion taken from thence to enquire, whether there be any Necessity (upon his principles) for the continual use of Baptism among the posterity of baptized Christians.' (Anonymous,) 8°. London, 1709, 19 pages.—The author argues, that if Dr. Wall's assertions be true, there is *no* necessity for continuing baptism *now*, to the descendants of such as have been once truly baptized.

The tract seems to be little known. The old edition of the *Biographia Britannica* does not notice it at all: and the later one, by Kippis, knows it only in its altered shape, as published with the author's name in 1710, calling that 'one of Mr. Emlyn's most curious productions.'

and their infant children; but not use it themselves in a nation where Christianity has been for some time settled.

He observes in his first page, that many others before me have spoken of this use of baptism among the Jews: which observation renders the page before (viz. the titlepage) very impertinent. For if the Jews' custom was such, and many others before me have spoke of it, the pretended consequence (or *improvement*, as he calls it) drawn from thence should be called an improvement of that custom, or of the books of those that spoke of it first, rather than of mine, which spoke of it last: so that he acts unkindly to say that my book gave him the *just occasion* he speaks of. And I had rather it should be taken from any body than from me: since I judge it such an improvement as all other errors are; a false and heretical consequence pretended to be drawn from premises which are true.

His main and only argument is, that since our Saviour gave his commission to his Apostles (of carrying baptism, together with the preaching of the Gospel, among all nations) in such short words, they must do with baptism as had been always done in their nation, except such circumstances wherein he has given any particular order for alteration. And therefore, that as the Jews baptized any new converted proselyte, and such children as he brought with him, but none of the posterity of them; and as the nation itself of the Jews was at first all baptized in Moses' time, men, women, and children, but none of their posterity afterward, so the Apostles, and succeeding Christians, should give the Christian baptism to all new converts, and to their infants. But in succeeding generations, a family or a nation, wherein the Christian religion has been for some time owned and professed, need not baptize their children at all, neither in infancy nor afterward. But the Christian baptism may wholly cease in such a nation, (as the Mosaical baptism did among the Jews, till there was set up a new baptism in the name of Christ,) except when any heathen convert comes over to Christianity.

And he is positive, that Christ in his Gospel has not given any rule for alteration in this matter, or any command which can oblige the posterity of baptized parents to receive baptism; but says, page 8, 'They are accounted as already baptized or cleansed, in their parents' baptism.' And in the next page he hugs that odd saying of Mr. Locke, 'They are born members of the Christian church.' Which whether it were meant to promote this tenet, I know not.

He has brought nothing new to confirm this *improvement* unknown to Christians, till vented by Socinus about one hundred and fifty years ago: nor has said in effect any thing more that I in my intro-



duction, sect. 3, mentioned as pleaded by the Socinians. So I need only refer to what I briefly said there to obviate their plea.

I observed there, after having set forth the Jews' way of managing baptism, that 'it was our Saviour who first ordered, by himself ' and by his forerunner, that every particular person, Jew or Gentile, ' or of what parents soever born, must be born again of water,' John iii. 3, 5. He says, page 10, 'These words of our Saviour can only ' relate to such as were converted from infidelity. Nor could Nicodemus be supposed to have understood them otherwise; since with ' the Jews only such were subjects of baptism.'

Such a skill in expounding Scripture is to be pitied. Our Saviours words are, All that do enter into the kingdom of heaven must be so born again. Is this only those that are converted from infidelity?

But Nicodemus knew of no other that were to be baptized. Then Mr. Emlyn would have Nicodemus understand our Saviour's words thus; 'All that you know are to be baptized must be baptized.' Whereas our Saviour informs Nicodemus of what he knew not before, that *all* must be baptized. And he adds, v. 7, *Ye must be born again.* Which *ye* being spoken to a Jew, includes those of that nation, as well as the heathens, who Nicodemus knew must be so born.

Our Saviour's next words (which I also cited a little after on the same occasion, Introduct. §. 5.) make it yet plainer: *That which is born of the flesh* (which I there paraphrased; whether of a Jewish or Gentile, baptized or unbaptized parent) *is flesh*; and must be *born again.* Mr. Emlyn takes no notice of this.

How he and the Socinians understood the point of original sin, or our natural generation in a corrupt state, I know not. But the catholic church has always understood this natural corruption to attend all that are born, not only of unbaptized or impious, but also of baptized and godly parents. I do, part i. chap. 19. §. 18, cite St. Austin urging the Pelagians with this absurdity, following from their doctrine; 'You that do affirm that of "parents cleansed from the ' stain of sin, such children should be born as are without sin," how ' is it that you do not mind, that at the same rate you might say, ' that of Christian parents there should be born Christian children? ' And then why do you determine that they are to be baptized?' St. Austin thought this latter to be too absurd for a Pelagian or any other heretic to say. But he did not think of our Socinians.

Mr. Emlyn, p. 4, that he may enforce the necessity of Christians imitating the Jews in the point of baptism, says, 'He can see no

‘argument for infant-baptism so forcible as this, taken from the ‘practice of baptizing Jewish proselytes.’ And adds, ‘Nor does ‘Mr. Wall seem to me to rely on any other *without this.*’ I guess he had wrote *but this*, (for that his argument required,) but seeing that would be too palpable, he altered it for *without this*. If a man use twenty arguments, none of the nineteen are *without* the twentieth.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth pages are spent in shewing the sufficiency of the proofs given by me and others of that custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes and their infants. ‘There being,’ he says, ‘so many testimonies of the Jewish writers who affirm the ‘fact, and the nature of the fact being to be open and visible, he ‘takes the proof to be of very great force, and not to be slighted ‘by such as cannot say half a quarter so much, indeed can say nothing at all, for proof of the negative. That the Jews saying to ‘John the Baptist, *Why dost thou baptize?* (meaning, thou who hast ‘no authority,) shews that they well understood the nature of baptism, but questioned his authority. That no writer denies this ‘custom, while so many affirm it; nor any of them who affirm it do ‘ever deny that it extends to infants. That all this taken together ‘ties the argument so hard, that the antipædobaptists cannot solve it. ‘That sir Norton Knatchbull’s exception against it is of no force. ‘That though the books that speak of it be written since Christ’s ‘time, yet inasmuch as they shew it to be the custom of their time, ‘and speak of it as a thing that had always been the custom of their ‘ancestors, he cannot think, that if it had not been really before ‘Christ’s time, it would ever have become a custom among the Jews ‘afterward.’ For, says he, ‘Would they begin to proselyte persons ‘to their religion by baptism in imitation of Jesus of Nazareth, whom ‘they held accursed? They would never so far own him as to ‘bring in a new institution in conformity to his command,’ &c.

Now all this I would have him dispute with Mr. Gale; for though I think his reasons here are concluding, yet I must be no judge of my own arguments. And besides, had rather no use at all should be made of them, than that ill one which he makes. But I will say, as St. Austin did, of two opponents which attacked him on two contrary sides, ‘Let each of them yield to the other so much ‘as there is of truth in that other’s argument; and they will both ‘come to confess the whole truth.’

The use that he makes is, that these arguments from the Jewish baptism do as strongly conclude that none of the posterity of Christians are bound by Christ’s commission to be baptized, as they

do that new converts, and the infants which they bring with them, are to be baptized. And so both pædobaptists and antipædobaptists will, he says, be ‘silenced at one blow :’ and, as he expresses it a little after, must ‘yield the cause to the Socinians.’ A perfect Goliath, this !

He sets forth our argument thus : our Lord Jesus left his apostles to apply baptism to all the same subjects as the Jews were wont to do, and therefore to infants as well as others. And his own thus : by the same reason the Christian baptism was to have no other subjects than the Jewish baptism had, viz. none of the offspring of believers (‘born of the church,’ as he calls it).

Whereas he should have laid down his general position thus : our Lord left his apostles to apply baptism, as the Jews were wont to do, except where he gave his own particular directions. But that he did in several things. He altered the form, making it to be, *In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. And the extent of it, ordering it to be the religion of *all* nations. And among other things, that no person whatever should be exempted from the use of it, ἐὰν μὴ τις, *Except any one have it, he cannot enter, &c.* And whereas the Jews were apt to say within themselves, *We have Abraham to our Father*, and so Nicodemus might dream (as our author does) of a sufficient purity by births :—he adds the next words ; *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, i. e. is in a corrupt and evil state, till it be born again. Which declaration of our Saviour, concerning the state of our first birth, makes the expression here used by our author and some others, ‘born in the church,’ to be an improper speech. The church is a society of persons born again. Almost all divines express themselves so. And particularly they that by *the kingdom of God* in this text do understand *the church*, or dispensation of the Messiah, are by our Saviour’s express words tied down to that meaning. For he says, they cannot enter into that without it. ‘Born within the pale of the church,’ is an expression that has been used in a sense that may be allowed, viz. within the reach of the opportunities of receiving baptism and Christian instruction.

This determination of our Saviour alone, and especially if there be added to it the other reasons, as that baptism is to us instead of circumcision, which was always given to the infants of natural Jews, as well as of proselytes ; and that the ancient Christians, who must know the apostles’ custom, baptized their own children, &c., is a sufficient warrant and injunction to us to recede from the example of the Jews in this particular.

The proofs which Mr. Emlyn, p. 8, produces from Scripture for his notion are but abuses of the texts he quotes : *If the root be holy, so are the branches*, Rom. xi. 16. Whence he concludes, the children of a holy parent do not need any such engrafting as baptism. St. Paul spoke those words concerning the nation of the Jews in his time ; which he shewed to be not a people cast away of God, (as some objected,) for that some of them had received the faith and were baptized ; and concerning the rest who were for the present blinded, and as *branches broken off*, there was hope they would not abide still in unbelief, but would be grafted in again ; for which the gracious regard which God had promised he would always have to that nation for the sake of their fathers would probably be effectual. To them the Gospel, and baptism into it, were first tendered : and the grace of God, which most of them had rejected hitherto, did yet wait for their return : which St. Paul there speaks of as a thing to be expected ; and on that account the Scripture gives them those favourable epithets and characters, *the children of the promise ; holy branches of the tree ; beloved for the fathers' sake* : though at present shewing themselves enemies. The whole scope of the places shews, that the apostle speaks these things concerning the aptitude they stood in to receive the benefits of the gospel, not that they had as yet received them ; nor ever would, except they did repent and were baptized. He calls them *holy*, because there was ground of hope that they would come in and be baptized ; not that they had already, and by birth, an *holiness* that would save them without baptism.

If Mr. Emlyn will compare the state of a Christian man's child with this state of the Jews ; there is indeed a like *aptitude* and likelihood of his being received into Christ's Church. But there is in it no argument against, but rather an argument for, the baptizing of the child. For those Jews, of whom St. Paul does so prognosticate good things, were to be baptized before they obtained them.

On the other text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy*, or, your children now are saints, or Christians, (from whence most moderns conclude they are to be baptized ; and Mr. Emlyn, that they need not be baptized at all,) I have spoken so largely, both in the book he writes against, and in another<sup>q</sup>, (where I shew it to be a com-

<sup>q</sup> [It is most probable that the author here alludes to the 'Critical Notes on the 'New Testament,' which it appears he had composed previous to this *Defence*,

although they were not published until the year 1730, some years after his death. —In that work is a long observation on 1 Cor. vii. 14, the most material part of



mon interpretation of the ancients, that St. Paul meant by those words, that *they were then already baptized*, and calls them, as he does other Christians, *saints*,) that I shall not repeat it here. Only whereas Mr. Emlyn here makes one objection against that exposition, I shall give my answer to it. I (after the ancients which I here cite) take St. Paul's discourse to run thus; let not the Christian man or wife put away, or go from, his or her partner that is as yet an unbeliever, (provided the unbelieving party be willing to cohabit,) but stay, in hopes of converting (and, as he styles it, *saving*) him or her. For this effect does by the grace of God commonly follow, that the unbelieving party 'has been sanctified' (i. e. converted, made a Christian, brought to baptism) 'by the believing party. Else' [if the unbelieving party were not ordinarily converted; or if he or she did go away with the children] 'the children would be unclean,' [brought up in heathenism (which the Scripture commonly calls an *unclean* state) and without baptism (which the Scripture commonly calls a *sanctifying* of the person)]: 'but now,' [by the cohabitation of the parents, and the unbelieving party being converted] 'they are 'saints,' i. e. made Christians by baptism.

Here Mr. Emlyn says, 'It is no good consequence which I make 'the apostle to draw; nor would it follow, that if the husband do 'not prevail upon his wife to be converted and baptized, the 'children would be left unbaptized: because though only the 'father were a believer, the child might be brought to baptism.'

It is true, it might possibly be so. But it was much more probable, if the other parent also were converted. Now the apostle

which is here given: 'He means, it has 'commonly and for the most part been 'seen, that the unbelieving party has been 'brought over by the believing party: 'which was a great encouragement for the 'believing party to stay with the other: 'as he says in verse 16, *What knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thine husband; and e contra. And then 'the sense of the next words (else were 'your children unclean, but now are they 'holy) is naturally this: else the children of such matches would be counted 'unfit to be dedicated to God by baptism: 'but now you see by the use of the 'Christian Church they are counted, as 'all other Christians are, ἅγιοι, holy, or 'saints. This is the sense in which the 'ancient Christians understood and expounded this text of Scripture. And 'all other expositions have this fatal incongruity, that they make St. Paul call 'an infidel man or woman sanctified, 'even while they continue infidel: which*

'is a thing he would never say. But to 'call baptism, or a conversion to Christianity, a sanctification, is a common phrase with the ancients.

'The antipædobaptists might perhaps 'think this to be a new-invented explication of the place, were not the commentaries of *Pelagius*, *St. Austin*, &c., 'who lived before the rise of antipædobaptists, extant, expounding it just so. 'See *History of Infant-Baptism*, part i. 'chap. 19.'

In confirmation of the substance of the foregoing note, the reader may consult a short piece published about this period, with a prefatory letter to Mr. Gale, entitled 'An Essay concerning Infant-Baptism, &c., by a Layman of the Church of England' [John Crossfield]. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1718.—At page 12 to 17 the writer comments upon this very text of 1 Cor. vii. 14, and refers to both Dr. Wall's and Mr. Gale's remarks on the passage.]

does often advise some good thing to be done, in order to obtain a good effect, which will much more probably follow, if his advice be followed, than it will if it be not: though it might possibly have followed without it.

Page 9, he interprets a sentence of Tertullian one way, which I had interpreted another way. There is no end of reciting his and mine. A reader of tolerable skill and exercise in reading a Latin author will easily decide the matter.

Another argument against the baptizing the children of Christians, either infant or adult, he ventures to fetch from the practice of the primitive Christians; which surely will be found against him.

He observes first, 'That in the Acts of the Apostles we find not 'one instance of the baptizing any, either infants or adult, that 'had been born of Christian parents: though that history do run 'through a series of near thirty years; in which time many must 'have been born to them, and grown up to maturity.'

I had, part ii. ch. 10. § 3, shewn how weak an argument this makes, when it is urged for antipædobaptism: and it is no less weak when urged for this antibaptism. I observed there, that St. Luke's aim in that history is to give a summary account of the main and principal passages of the lives of some of the apostles; and of those passages especially, in which they found the greatest opposition; which was in *converting* heathens or Jews, and not in baptizing them (after they were converted) or their children, which was commonly left to deputies. Were it not for one word of St. James, Acts xxi. 21, (which was spoken merely upon occasion,) we should not know by the Acts, that the Christian Jews at Jerusalem (of whom there were many thousands, verse 20) did use to *circumcise* their children (which yet they generally did,) for there is no instance of any particular man that did so. So little wonder is it that there is no particular mention of their baptizing them. And yet (as I there observed) of the six baptisms (which are all that St. Paul is mentioned to be concerned in) three were of whole households, Acts xvii. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16. Such an one, and *all his*; by which expression his *children* are especially understood. But these, Mr. Emlyn will say, ought to be baptized; because they had been born during the parents' infidelity. The question with him is, concerning children born afterwards. Now inasmuch as these would be baptized in infancy, if at all; and St. Luke does not stand to rehearse the ordinary affairs of infants; their baptism cannot well be expected to be recited in the Acts, no more than the circumcising of the infants of the Jewish Christians. But that the

Christians of Corinth had, in that interval of five years' time, which had passed from St. Paul's planting a church there to the writing of his Epistle from Ephesus to them, been used to baptize their children, appears by the foresaid text; at least by a probable, and the ancient interpretation of it. For else why does he call the children *saints*, i. e. Christians?

We may note by the way, the great power of prejudice. Mr. Emlyn says, page 10, (and two or three times before,) 'that I have shewn well that infants along with their proselyted parents are to be entered into the Christian society by baptism, but not shewn the same for their posterity.' The antipædobaptists think the proof clear for the *posterity* of Christians to be baptized, but not in infancy. The argument from the silence of the Acts of the Apostles presses hardest upon the antipædobaptists; for the cases of adult persons are more apt to be mentioned in a history, than of infants. And since no adult baptism of any descendant of Christian parents is recorded there, (not even of Timothy, whose circumcision at his adult age is mentioned,) it is a sign that they had been baptized before in their infancy.

Mr. Emlyn ventures farther into ecclesiastic history; and demands, how early instances I or any other can give of the baptism of any person born of Christians. To which I answer, all the proof and evidence that I or any other have given of infant-baptism in those ancient times is of the baptism of children born of Christians. For wherever those ancients do speak of infants baptized, they mean infants of Christians. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, &c., for what they say of infants, do mean these. For the case of baptizing the infants of any heathen happened either never at all, or so seldom, as not to be brought to account. It could never be but when a Christian happened to have the custody of a heathen's child. At that time the heathens might, if they pleased, take away from the Christians their children; but not the Christians from them. Mr. Emlyn seems to be aware of this; and therefore strikes in here with the antipædobaptists; and says, that I have given no instances at all that are early enough. He makes some dispute about Tertullian; none against Irenæus or Origen, and expressly yields St. Cyprian. I shall not stand (now in my present discourse with him) to vindicate the former evidences. But only note these few things.

Tertullian, who disliked the baptizing the children of Christians *in infancy*, unless in danger of death, is positive in this; that they should however be baptized, when they come to understanding.

‘ Let them come to Christ when they are grown up ; let them come when they understand ; when they are instructed whither it is that they come : let them be made Christians when they can know Christ,’ &c., as I quoted him (and this, by the way, shews he did not count them Christians till baptized.) And at another place which I cited from him, says, ‘ All believers from thenceforward’ (i. e. from Christ’s time) ‘ were baptized.’ And therefore the progeny of Christians, as well as converted heathens.

And Justin Martyr, born in the Apostles’ time, having set forth the manner of the Christians’ receiving the holy communion, adds, *Apol. 2. prope finem*, ‘ This eating and drinking is called the Eucharist ; of which it is not lawful for any to partake but one that believes the things taught by us to be true, and has been washed with that laver which is for the remission of sins, and for regeneration.’ These were, many of them, the descendants of Christians, and must have been baptized : for else, Justin says, they could not receive the Eucharist ; so that Mr. Emlyn’s question at the end of his treatise, ‘ Whether a person may communicate at the Lord’s table, who is born *in Christianity*’ (so he words it ; he should have said in *Christendom*) ‘ of baptized parents, but has not himself been baptized in person,’ (which question, he says, may be determined by what he has there said,) has been from the beginning already determined against him. For Justin says, ‘ None must partake but baptized persons.’ Not now to mention Mr. Whiston’s Scripture, which both expressly charges Christians to baptize their infants ; and at another place forbids any unbaptized person to communicate at the Lord’s table, on pain of eternal damnation. But I have been too long in refuting so ill-grounded and exploded an error.

I had said in my introduction, that all children admitted into covenant were wont to have some badge or sign of such admission. Some had circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. The female children of proselytes, baptism and sacrifice. The female children of natural Jews had at least a sacrifice offered for them. This last Mr. Emlyn denies : saying, ‘ It is not true ;’ and (being a great judge) gives his warrant, that though I have confidently affirmed it, I cannot prove it. I can prove that it is the interpretation of Scripture, and of the books of the Jewish writers, given by far better judges than himself. I had it from the learned Dr. Allix, who being kindly pleased to make some notes on what I had in the introduction written concerning the Jewish customs, added this ; and could, I make no doubt, have given proofs. However, I myself had in my



book, part i. chap. 5. sect. 1, quoted Origen affirming a sacrifice to be offered for every infant, and referring to that text, Levit. xii. 8, *A pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons: one for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering.* Where he adds, ‘For what sin is this one ‘pigeon offered? Can the child that is new-born have committed ‘any sin?’ He answers, ‘It has even then sin,’ &c., and proceeds to speak of the Christian baptism of infants as ordered by the Apostles for that reason among others. And Mr. Emlyn cannot escape, as the antipædobaptists do, by denying the book, when they cannot reconcile their practice to it. For besides that sayings to this purpose do so often occur in his translated works, that they cannot be all thought to be interpolated; his Greek works have the like. One whereof I there, sect. 7, recited out of the seventh book *contra Cels.* where he tells Celsus; ‘The Prophets’ (or books of the Jewish Law) ‘do order a sin offering to be offered’ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄρτι γεγεννημένων, ὡς οὐ καθαρῶν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. Where ἄρτι γεγεννημένων is so exactly the same phrase with Ruffinus’ *nuper editus parvulus*, that there is little doubt but that it was the same word which is so translated in that Homily on the Romans. And when the blessed Virgin at her purification made this offering, Luke ii. 24, it is expressed, v. 27, that Simeon came in when the parents *brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law.* From which (and perhaps other proofs) learned men do conceive the offering to have been for the child then born; or partly for the woman and partly for the child. And though this was a child that could need no sin offering; yet it pleased God, that in this, and in circumcision and baptism, there should be in his case *fulfilled all the righteousness of the law.* And though this was the case of a male-child, the law, Levit. xii. makes this obligation equal on the birth of a male or female child. Mr. Emlyn, if he meet with a thing which he does not understand, should not presently conclude, ‘It is not true,’ or, that nobody can prove it. He says, p. 12, that there is as plain testimony from St. Cyprian that it was ‘customary to give the Eucharist to ‘infants’ (and he speaks as one that means mere infants, or the youngest infants) ‘as there is for baptizing them.’ And, that he does not see ‘any better authority from antiquity for one than the ‘other.’ Now though I *think* this is not true, and that he cannot prove it; I will not be positive, till I see whether he can or not. There is the more need he should, if he can; because two that have written since him, Mr. Gale and Mr. Whiston, have followed him in that affirmation. And what he has spoken doubtfully, they have said positively. Since they all three have written against my book,

they ought in all reason to have refuted the instances that I there, part ii. chap. 9. § 15, 16, 17, give of the great difference between the evidence from antiquity which is brought for infants' baptism, and which is brought for their receiving the other sacrament, before they had so securely affirmed it to be alike. And it happens well, that I did there put in a caveat against allowing any evidence for the latter from Clement's Constitutions: and also that I shewed the mistake of those who have said (as Mr. Emlyn does here) that St. Austin pretended that the latter (the doctrine of giving the communion to infants) is an apostolic tradition as well as the former.

As to the consequence for baptizing Christians' children to enter them into covenant, taken from the circumcising of the children of the Jews, which was for the same purpose; Mr. Emlyn allows that St. Paul does speak of baptism as being to Christians instead of circumcision; and that St. Paul's words, Col. ii. 11, 12, are so to be understood (being a fairer disputant than Mr. Gale, who will not own that sense of the words, though it be very plain); but yet Mr. Emlyn says, 'It does not follow that the subjects of each must be the same;' and instances in the females. I answer, it does follow that they should be the same, except where the gospel rules do direct an alteration. But St. Paul, discoursing of baptism, Gal. iii. 27, 28, says, that in respect of it *there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither male nor female, &c.*; i. e. there is no difference between them.

As for the rest of his remarks, that I have given too disrespectful a censure on Grotius, I have spoke my mind before; and do here add, that that is nothing to him, nor to his cause. That I have used expressions too sharp against the Socinians, (which, I fancy, gave occasion to his writing against me,) it is, because I take that opinion to be, not like theirs who differ from us in smaller matters, but so directly contrary to an infinite number of plain declarations of scripture concerning our blessed Saviour, that it deserves abhorrence, and has been in all ages abhorred by all Christians, not only Catholics, but Arians, and even Eunomians.

I shall not stand to answer any of his weak arguments for it, save that he takes more advantage than there is any good ground for from the words of the Latin and English translations of Col. i. 15, where Christ is in those languages styled 'Primogenitus omnis creaturæ,' *The first-born of every creature*; or, as he chooses to render it, 'The first begotten of the creation.' The sense of which words, and consequence from them, he slyly insinuates to be, that

Christ has no other nature than a *created* one. The Greek words themselves do not give any such occasion. For *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* was always understood by the Greeks (who best knew the emphasis of their own language) even by the Arians, to signify, not ‘First-born of the creatures,’ so as to include him among them; but ‘Genitus ante omnem creaturam;’ *Begotten before all the creation*. And it was this very phrase of the apostle, Col. i. 15, which they in almost all their creeds paraphrased by those words, ‘Begotten before all worlds.’ Eusebius at the council of Nice recites the creed of his church, which gives first the apostle’s own words, *πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*; and immediately subjoins by way of explication, *πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον*, ‘Begotten of God the Father before all worlds’ [or ages]. And so it is in the Constantinopolitan creed, the Arian creed at Antioch, and in Arius’ own creed: which is much more unexceptionable than to say, ‘First-born of every creature.’

Mr. Emlyn seems at the end of his book to be solicitous, where, or in what church, he and his partners in this opinion shall be admitted to receive the communion, without believing the divinity of Christ, and without being baptized. He says, p. 16, that I, no question, take care ‘to have no Socinian communicants in my ‘parish.’ I am glad he has that opinion of me. And p. 18, he is angry with me for saying, as I do at the end of chap. 9 of the second part; ‘Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ‘ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion ‘before he was baptized.’ I quoted just now Justin Martyr saying the same.

But if the church of England will not, he should not, methinks, despair of finding some that will receive them. For we have of late in England great store of churches; and in the shops of religion, great store of new suits, that a man must have very ill luck, whom none of them will fit. As the course of trade for religions now goes, if he cannot fit himself in England, I question whether he can be fitted in Holland with any church; as the word *church* is taken for a society or body, consisting of pastors and people. But there is lately set up in England another notion, fitter for this purpose than any that has yet been broached in Holland itself;—That the church of Christ is not a society, or a body that requires any union, or coherence, or government. It is only the *number*, small or great, *dispersed* or *united*, of persons that adhere to king Jesus. And the less regard they have to any spiritual governors, ministers, rule or order, and the more close and *immediate*



this adhesion is to Christ, the better. So that our author, if he can find no minister of Christ that will give him the communion, nor any one that will receive it with him, may take it himself alone, by virtue of that *close and immediate* dependence upon Christ.

This answers the wishes of all heterodox and self-opinionated men by one position. And as the flatterers of the Persian king, though they could not find any law for this or that lustful course which he followed, yet found one that was worth them all; that a king of Persia might do what he pleased; so, though there be no encouragement in Scripture for Socinianism, omission of baptism, &c., this lays open a gap for all at once, that every man may be of what religion he pleases, and interpret Scripture as he thinks fit, without any control from any church, or any governors, any articles, canons, or censures thereof; or from the received doctrines and interpretation of any ancient Christians or Fathers, those ‘weak men in several ages.’

This position, I confess, seems a desperate one for a man to venture his soul upon; because though according to it Christ has not any kingdom, nor does interpose in this world, yet the kingdom of the other world to which we must come, is all his; and he has declared, that we shall be judged there at the last day by the word which he has given us here; and a great part of that word is, that we should in this world ‘hear the church,’ and obey them that have by his appointment the rule over us.

Mr. Whiston<sup>r</sup> was not the next that wrote against my book. Mr. Gale wrote before him. But because I have a mind to despatch at once, what I have to answer to all such of my antagonists as have written in the way of civility, candour, modesty, and argument, before I enter on answering Mr. Gale’s *Reflections*, which are made up of declamation, insulting reproaches, and untruths; I shall next take a short view of what Mr. Whiston has observed concerning it. And it need be but a short one, for it is little that he has said. The account that he has given of the reasons of the change of his opinion about infant-baptism, seems to have been written in as much haste, as the change itself was made. I am concerned only in that part of it where he pretends to shew, that in the passages of the Fathers, which I produced concerning the baptism of infants, the word *infants* may be understood of

<sup>r</sup> [In a piece called ‘Primitive Infant-baptism revived: or an account of the doctrine and practice of the two first

centuries concerning the baptism of infants.’ 8vo. London, 1712. (pp. 48.)]



children old enough to have been catechised, and capable of baptism upon their own profession, and faith of the Christian religion.

And first, as to the passage of Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 39, where *infants* are reckoned among those of the several ages [‘infants and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons’] which are by Christ regenerated unto God: he had before, p. 7, granted it to be undeniable ‘that the word *regeneration* is generally, if not constantly, used with relation to *baptismal regeneration*.’ And it is indeed, as he says, a thing *undeniable* by any modest arguer. Neither does he, like Mr. Gale, fly to that pitiful subterfuge, of denying the passage to be genuine. He grants the place to speak of the baptism of infants. But says, [page 35.]

‘Irenæus does so soon after this passage expressly reckon ‘thirty years of age the beginning of *youth*, and forty of *elder age*, and by consequence must allow *infancy* to reach till ten; that this ‘testimony only shews that such children as he calls *infants* were ‘then commonly by ten years old regenerated in *baptism*.’

Now supposing that in Irenæus’ use of those words, a person were continued to be called an *infant* till he was ten, and a *little one* till twenty, and a *child* till thirty, and a *youth* till forty (as he does indeed toward the end of that chapter make the interval between youth and elder age to be ten). But to call them *infants* till ten, and *parrulos* till twenty, and *pueros* till thirty, is something more contrary to the common sense of words than the other. And I think to discourse that matter with Mr. Gale, the first inventor of that *salvo*. But supposing it were so, the word *infant* does still include all the time from birth to ten years. And there is no reason to take it here for *only* those of ten years, with an exclusion of mere infants. Especially when Irenæus’ argument at that place runs upon a supposal of taking in every period of man’s age, and every step of that period. He says, ‘Christ sanctified every several age ‘by the likeness that it has to him. For he came to save all ‘persons by himself. All, I mean, who by him are regenerated ‘unto God; infants, and little ones, and children, and youths and ‘elder persons; therefore he went through the several ages; for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants: to little ones he ‘was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age,’ &c. [page 34.]

Now does Mr. Whiston think that Irenæus meant that Christ, by going through the several steps of human life, did sanctify infants only, in the last step of their infancy? He uses the terms of Christ’s

‘going through, saving and sanctifying’ the ages and the persons, and of the persons being by him regenerated, in the same latitude and extent: every age by the likeness it has to the several ages which he for our sakes took upon him to go through. Was Christ made an infant only in that sense of the word, whereby it signifies one of ten years? Was he not also made an infant in the common acceptance of it, so as to go through all the steps of infancy? Did he come to save and sanctify only the tenth year of infancy, that that only should be by him regenerated unto God?

And whereas Mr. Whiston here grants that this testimony of Irenæus shews ‘that children were then commonly by ten years old ‘regenerated in baptism,’ but thinks that this was upon their own profession and faith; and to that purpose extols the care of Christian parents in those days to give their children early instruction; so that great part of the children might be baptized at that age upon their own faith: the experience of the whole world shews the contrary of this, in respect to the generality, or any considerable number of children: for though children do in these late ages arrive to a maturity of sense and capacities, rather sooner than they did in former ages; yet there are none, or no considerable number of children, that would be fit at that age to receive adult baptism.

We find it to be so in the examining, preparing, and catechising of children in order to their being confirmed by the bishop. That office is, God be thanked, used with more care and frequency than formerly. But the bishops find a necessity of giving directions that none be admitted under eleven, (as some do order, or twelve or thirteen as others,) except some particular children of extraordinary forwardness. And (as I shewed in the Introduction) the rule of the Jews in receiving the children of any proselyte to baptism was, if they were males, and under the age of thirteen years and a day, or females under twelve years and a day, to baptize them as infants; because such an one was not yet ‘the son of assent,’ i. e. not capable to give assent for himself. And indeed we find few that are capable to be confirmed so soon as eleven or twelve. They may be able to repeat the words of a catechism, or summary of the faith; and to make the answers to questions put to them, with a ready and pregnant forwardness. And fond parents, that are conceited of their children’s capacities, are sometimes importunate, and proud of the credit, to have them admitted to the ordinance. But they really do their children a prejudice, in making them receive it so young, when it has little effect on their consciences; and thereby disabling them from ever receiving it afterward; which might else have been

done to great spiritual benefit, being received with a due degree of serious consideration. A child of that age may have memory and words ready; but seldom can have due sense and conscience of the weight and concern of the thing to his soul.

It must be noted, that Irenæus does not here speak of the case of some particular child, who by some extraordinary forwardness was baptized in infancy; but mentioning infants generally and indefinitely, speaks of them as ordinarily regenerated or baptized; so that Mr. Whiston is forced by the tenour of the argument to grant, that at that time children were *commonly* by ten years old baptized; which tenour of the argument Mr. Gale not perceiving, brings in at his page 321, 322, a story of ‘some that he has known admitted to ‘baptism at about fourteen: and heard of some much younger.’ Which is impertinent and to no purpose here to explain the sense of Irenæus, who speaks of the general case of infants baptized. But I hope to make it appear in my answer to Mr. Gale, that we have no reason to suppose that Irenæus used the words in any other sense than all people do.

Mr. Gale had invented this notion of infant-boys of ten years to evade this place in Irenæus. He was not so absurd as to pretend that the sayings of Tertullian, Origen, &c., could be so evaded. Because they (beside the word *infants*) do express such circumstances as do denote mere infants in the common sense of the word. But Mr. Whiston, having this hint given, fell so in love with it, as to venture (against common sense) to apply it to the passages of other Fathers which I had cited; who do as plainly describe the infants they speak of to be children newly born, or not yet come to the use of reason, as it is possible in words to describe them.

The quotations out of Tertullian he recites just as I had done, at p. 36, 37, 38. Now the infants that Tertullian speaks of (whom there was then a custom to baptize; but he would have had it omitted, except in danger of death) were infants in our sense of the word. For he speaks of them as such as, when they were brought to baptism, ‘did not understand whither it was that they came; ‘did not know Christ; whose guiltless age had no need, as he ‘thought, of the forgiveness of sins.’

But the foulest work which he makes with my quotations, is at his thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth pages, with those out of Origen. He pretends that Origen’s words, as well as Irenæus’, are capable of being taken for infants of ten years. But see how he defends this pretence.

I had cited the *Hom. 8. in Levitic. cap. 12.* Of that he takes a part

out of my translation ; but leaves out the other part, where Origen cites, as a reason for baptizing infants, the Septuagint Job xiv. 4, 5, *None is clean from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.* Which shews what sort of infants he meant ; but was not for Mr. Whiston's turn to set down.

He deals yet worse with the passage cited from the *Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos*, lib. v. He recites the latter part of this out of my translation ; but leaves out the beginning. Which (to shew Mr. Whiston's readers how he deals with them and with me) I must here recite<sup>s</sup>.

' In the Law it is commanded, that a sacrifice be offered for every child that is born : a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons ; of which one is for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering. For what sin is this one pigeon offered ? Can the child newborn [nuper editus parvulus] have committed any sin ?' He answers, ' It has even then sin,' &c. After which follows that which Mr. Whiston sets down, of the apostles ordering baptism even to infants ; as knowing that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit.

I would willingly (if the reader will consent to it) impute this way of quoting, not to insincerity, but to the haste in which Mr. Whiston wrote this little piece. If he will have patience to read it over again, he will see that the infants Origen speaks of are infants new-born.

I gave an instance before, in answering Mr. Emlyn<sup>t</sup>, that in other books of Origen the Greek words which are there preserved have the same argument, and the same phrase [ἄρτι γεγεννημένοι], which St. Hierome and Rufinus do here translate, ' nuper editi parvuli,' concerning new-born infants not being clean from sin. And indeed Mr. Whiston does not insist on the exception, that these books are but translations by the two said men. He gives his judgment concerning them, that though they are of less authority than those that remain in Greek, yet he thinks ' we may allow them ' in the main to be genuine,' (which is fairer than Mr. Gale, who shuffles off the argument, as if so many several places in several books, by several translators could all be interpolated.) But he adds, that this account of Origen, where he speaks of such infants baptized as did not ' want it for the pardon of actual sins done at ' years of discretion,' is near to his own account, or his sense of the word. If so, if a new-born infant, such as is spoken of in Levit. xii, be near in the same case as one that is to be baptized upon his own

<sup>s</sup> [See vol. i. p. 65, 66.]

<sup>t</sup> [See above, p. 384.]



faith ; or if a youth that is not of years of discretion to have actual sins imputed to him, be of discretion to be baptized upon his own repentance, Mr. Whiston need never fear the reconciling of any thing to any thing.

Therefore in the next words, being conscious, I suppose, that this would appear inconsistent, he adds further, ‘ Though if it implies ‘ more, (i. e. if Origen must be understood of mere infants,) it will ‘ only shew how early this *corruption* of Christian baptism began to ‘ creep into the church of Alexandria, as well as we have seen [from ‘ Tertullian, I suppose, he means] it began to creep into that of ‘ Africa ; and no more.’

He here yields up the times of Tertullian and Cyprian for the churches of Africa. And in a manner yields the time of Origen for the church of Alexandria. And at page 42, having owned infant-baptism used at Alexandria in the time of Didymus, he adds, ‘ Possibly——even in the days of Origen, as we have already ‘ observed.’

It were better for the antipædobaptists at once to yield that it began in the apostles’ time ; and help all by styling it, as Mr. Whiston here does, ‘ a corruption creeping in.’ This would save a great deal of vain struggle. And it seems probable that they must at last come to this. Mr. Whiston (who is much more conversant in the books of those times than any of them) gives up the times of Tertullian and Origen, (within one hundred years of the apostles,) as using this ‘ corrupt practice’ (as he calls it) of baptizing mere, or new-born infants ; and cannot deny that Irenæus himself (born in, or very near, the apostles’ times) speaks of *infants* baptized ; saving himself only upon Mr. Gale’s device of another sense of the word *infant* as used by Irenæus ; which I think by and by to evince to Mr. Gale, or at least to any impartial reader, to be a groundless notion.

And yet this same Mr. Whiston, who not long ago in his ‘ Essay ‘ on the Revelations<sup>u</sup>’ had spoken of the times, not only of St. Cyprian, but two hundred years lower down, as continuing in Christian purity, and being above the date of *Antichristian* corruptions ; so that what doctrines and practices of the church we find to have been then generally received we may depend upon as sound, (among which he reckons by name the *divinity of Christ* and the *baptism of infants*,) having since fallen first from the belief of one of these, and now of the other, tells us, page 45, that the baptism of infants [meaning infants in the common sense of the word] is one

<sup>u</sup> [Published at Cambridge in 1706. 4<sup>o</sup>.]

of those 'practices, doctrines, and customs, which appear to have begun in the West, near Rome, and particularly in Africa; and are to be looked upon as part of the Roman, Western, or Anti-christian corruptions: and to be accordingly rejected by every Christian.'

As on the one side by yielding the times of Tertullian and Cyprian, (for those he means by the evidence of the African churches' corruption,) and in a manner giving up Origen and the church of Alexandria, (as I shewed before,) he leaves but a very small space after the apostles for the antipædobaptists to pretend any claim to; so on the other side, by calling these doctrines and practices of the church (and some other from which he has revolted) *Romish* and *Antichristian* corruptions, and yet owning them to have taken place so early, he gives a scandalous encouragement to the Deists and enemies of Christianity. By confessing it to have been generally corrupted in its doctrines so far up, he gives them a handle to say it was never otherwise. These do apparently hug and value him and other heterodox men for such sayings as these. Whatever serves to weaken the credit or the authority of Christ's church, helps forward the designs which they are now carrying on.

But to make Origen an evidence only for the church of Alexandria, is a great oversight in the history of his life. He was indeed born there; and if his father held the same doctrine, (as we have not the least reason to question,) baptized there, eighty-five years after the apostles. But of the time of his mature age and writing, the least part was spent there. He conversed at times in almost all the noted churches in the world; and his testimony is an evidence for them all.

The censure of the churches of Africa, as holding *Antichristian* corruptions, for their being in the *West*, and near *Rome*, is yet more absurd and unhistorical. It is a known thing, and observed by almost every body, that no church in the world did more vigorously oppose the first encroachments of the bishops of Rome than that of Carthage, and the rest of Africa. But the times we are now upon were long before those encroachments and corruptions. Several of the bishops of Rome about the time of St. Cyprian patiently and humbly suffered death for their religion, as he himself also did. And as to the points he here calls *corruptions*, the Roman and African, and all other churches in the world, were then unanimous.

As for the following quotations alleged by me, which he says, at

p. 41, he will ‘run over,’ and shew, that even the fourth century was not unanimous for baptizing infants in the common sense of the word; he runs so hastily and heedlessly, that it is not worth the while to follow him.

The council of Neo-Cæsarea affords, he says, no argument for infant-baptism. All that I pretended was, that it affords none for or against it; and to shew that Grotius perverted the true sense and meaning of the words of it, when he pretended an argument from them against it. Mr. Whiston only recites the words, takes no notice of what I had said to clear the sense of them; and, though he does not offer to affirm, yet he poorly insinuates to the ignorant reader that conclusion from them against infant-baptism, which ought to be taken for a mistaken one, till somebody has pretended to defend it.

He observes, that I own that Gregory Nazianzen seems not to have been baptized in infancy, though his father was a bishop; which is very carelessly expressed. That he was not baptized in infancy does not *seem*, but is certain; neither in our sense of the word, nor in his. Whether his father was a Christian (for there is no pretence that he was a bishop) at the time of his birth, is a greater question than I at first thought; the reasons that make it doubtful I gave above to Mr. Bernard. It is however but a single man’s fact, differing from a custom and practice of the church, which is fully and plainly proved for those times.

This catching at twigs one would bear with in Mr. Whiston. But as for that passage in this Gregory’s sermon, where he sets the several degrees of punishment to those that have died unbaptized, which he makes to be thus: some wholly scorned it, whose punishment will be the greatest; some miss of it by procrastination; who deserve not quite so bad; some ‘have it not in their power to receive it, (*οὐκ εἶσιν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δεξασθαι*,) either because of their ‘infancy perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly involuntary,’—which last sort will neither be glorified nor punished; as, being without the seal, but not through their own fault, (or wickedness):—for this passage, I say, after Grotius had picked out those words by themselves, (‘have it not in their power to receive it because of their infancy,’) and had set them among the arguments against infant-baptism; and after that I had, by reciting the whole place, plainly shewn that dealing of Grotius to be either foul and imposturous, or at least a gross mistake or heedlessness, either in taking the quotation at second hand, or in not reading the whole place; or, as Mr. Bernard guesses, writing in too much haste:

after all this, for Mr. Whiston to put this again upon his reader, (whom he must think a very ignorant one,) as if it were meant by St. Gregory against infant-baptism, (when he plainly uses it as a reason for the parents to give it, lest the child lose all reward,) and to set it down just as Grotius had done; ('yet he speaks of some ' that have it not in their power (or are not capable) to receive baptism on account of their infancy;') thus to quote a scrap of a sentence to a purpose directly contrary to the import that it carries in the sentence, and which it had been plainly shewn to carry, is, I cannot help saying, in him (whatever it might be in Grotius) a prevarication which I thought no writer, pretending to sincerity, would have been guilty of.

And whereas Gregory at one place delivers, as his particular opinion, that if a child be in no danger of death, it may be fit to defer his baptism till three years, but otherwise to give it presently; he, having observed that three years is the time of catechising in the *Constitutions*, ridiculously infers; 'So that we have here a ' witness against infant-baptism in the modern sense, excepting the ' case of danger of death.' What! does he think that the three years of catechising was the first three years of the child's life? Or would Gregory's child of three years be baptized by adult-baptism?

As for the other passages of the fourth century which I had quoted, of which he, instead of taking them in order, picks out here and there one, where he thinks the words may possibly be wrested to signify, not *infants* properly, but children fit to go to school, or to be catechised; I think the reading of the passages, and comparing what I have said with what he has said, will satisfy any one that thinks his labour worth his while, of the impropriety of the explication he puts upon them; and therefore shall not repeat them. The sense and meaning of the word *infant* was (for certain in that age, whatever may be questioned of the former) limited and known by common use, as will appear to those that read the passages.

There was indeed a custom of calling *converts* newly baptized (though they were middle-aged, or old) *infants*, by way of allusion; and a sermon made to a congregation of such was called, *Sermo ad Infantes*<sup>x</sup>. But it is always evident at first sight when the word is taken properly, and when in this borrowed sense which it obtained only in allusion to those infants, properly speaking, who had ever been the subject of baptism. This I had noted in the chapter con-

<sup>x</sup> [See, for example, several of St. Augustin's so denominated.]



cerning Paulinus, part i. chap. 18. § 1. And I believe it is to that note that I owe the greatest trouble that we have had from Mr. Gale, and all that we have had from Mr. Whiston. For Mr. Gale took occasion to evade the force of Irenæus's testimony by this distinction, (which, I had noted, might take place in those verses of Paulinus,) and Mr. Whiston confesses, [p. 35,] that he took the hint from Mr. Gale, and he has ventured to apply it in the case of other passages, where the sense shews that it can have no place. The passage wherein he thought this application to be of most use is that taken out of that spurious book called 'Clement's Constitutions,' which he values above all the genuine pieces of the ancient Christian writers, or any book of Scripture. There happens to be in that book no other mention of infant-baptism than in those few words, 'Baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God. For he says, *Suffer little children to come to me,*' &c.

This, which I and all others have thrust down among the evidences out of spurious books, of little credit and value, he at p. 45 calls 'the only original law for infant-baptism.' And finding that he could interpret this his own way, because there is in so few words no circumstance ascertaining their age, (though he should have noted that it first says, 'Baptize your infants;' and then 'bring them up in the nurture,' &c.) he has endeavoured to sacrifice all the genuine testimonies of antiquity to his own improbable interpretation of a passage in a book, set out about the latter end of the fourth century, by somebody who forged the names of the apostles to it; containing indeed some good rules and sayings and exhortations, such as might probably be remembered by tradition to have been delivered by some apostle or apostolical man; but some other things utterly inconsistent with history and with Scripture. And has the vanity to think, that the church of Christ will (now after it has been rejected as spurious for thirteen hundred years) take it on his recommendation as one, nay, as the chief, of their canonical books. And as to baptism, says, p. 46, (what one cannot read without pity,) 'All modern ways of baptizing' (he means, both of pædobaptists and, as he had said in the same paragraph, anti-pædobaptists) 'are very imperfect, and ought to be reduced to the original standard in the *Constitutions* immediately.' He is in great haste, and would have us change our religion, church, and canon of Scripture, as fast as he has done.

At the time of his writing this little piece, 1712, he was a convert to anti-pædobaptism, but of a very small standing; and yet was

even then become as great a proficient in his zeal against the doctrine of infant-baptism as those of Munster; so as to impute it to the devil. For at page 44 he concludes thus: ‘In short, this ‘corrupt practice came in, &c., till at last, &c., it came to be ‘applied to babes of three months or three days, &c., so successful ‘was the devil and his agents in corrupting,’ &c. Does he consider whom he gives up (I mean, of such as he himself owns to have practised infant-baptism; not to say any thing now of the apostles; but St. Cyprian, St. Austin, &c., and the church of their times) as ‘agents for the devil?’

Those that I have hitherto been speaking to have concerned themselves with my book but briefly and occasionally. But Mr. Gale, in 1711, wrote professedly against it. And though the greatest part of his book be either of personal matters, some about my life, temper, actions, &c., not relating to the cause, and some about my way of writing when it is too long, or too short, or too censorious; or catching at here and there a passage of my book, which he thought might be represented so as to put me out of favour with the antipædobaptists, (as are his first two chapters, which he calls ‘My Character;’) or else on another subject, viz. not the *age* or *time* of receiving baptism, but the *way* of administering it, with which I had meddled very little, (as are his three next;) yet he gave to the whole the title of ‘Reflections’ on my book.

And though he go no farther in any methodical way of answering than to the *Introduction* and first five chapters of my book, (not nigh one tenth part of it,) which answer begins at his ninth chapter, (and he has but thirteen in all,) yet it has gone among the men of his party as an *answer* to it.

He deals not much with *argument*, (which the others have chiefly aimed at,) but writes in a way of declaiming and flourish, and much addicted to reproaching, taking a pride in shewing how easily and how naturally he can express a contempt of his adversary, or of any reason or argument. He writes in a style indeed sufficiently fluent, and with a good stock of philological learning; but does not keep very close to the rules of candour, modesty, or truth; but delights in vaunting, insulting, slighting, and laying odious and false imputations, not on me only, but on the clergy of England in general, and indeed our whole church; as that was a time in which some people found their advantage by raising such slanders.

‡ [See, for instance, Crosby’s History of the English Baptists, vol. iv. p. 367.—The Life of Joseph Stennet, prefixed to his

works.—Ivimey’s History of the Baptists, vol. iv. p. 214, &c.

His talent in rhetoric (which is not inconsiderable) he uses to false colouring, and ‘gaining his point,’ (as he calls it,) by wrested representations of things and passages.

Of his *impertinencies*, (to name but one sort of them,) an unparalleled instance is, his picking up stories of things said or done by me before he was born<sup>z</sup>; and naming the people<sup>a</sup>, (whose names one would never have thought to have seen in print.) Nothing, thanks be to God, of which one need be ashamed. But it is a great shame to see such impertinent stuff brought into a controversy of religion. Of his *untruths*, I would beforehand instance in one flagrant and manifest one, (which, as I shall shew, he has affirmed above twenty times over,) his saying, that I have in my book yielded and owned that there is no *Scripture-proof* for infant-baptism; though near half his book be spent in refuting (as well as he can) those proofs which I brought from Scripture. The province which I had undertaken was the history of the times near following; but I did not altogether omit those of Scripture.

If I had followed my own inclinations, or the advice of some of my friends, in drawing up an answer to him; I should have made it shorter by half than it is, and taken notice only of those few reflections of his that seemed to be of moment to the main point. The tyranny of custom obliges me, not only to take more pains than I needed, by the dry work of following him *κατὰ πόδας*, and answering to many things that are impertinent to the cause, or of small weight in it; but also, when I have done it, to make an excuse to any judicious reader why I did it.

Such an one will pardon me, if he consider, that some captious and litigious men would otherwise have been apt to say, that I had passed over the most material objection.

To spare the time of those who are choice of it, (though I had not liberty to spare my own,) I must advertise them, that there is hardly any thing in Mr. Gale’s first six chapters, or in my answer to them, that is very material to the point of infant-baptism. And it will be no great loss to step over them.

A vein of boasting and magnifying his own performance runs through all his book. With that he continues his work, and with that he ends; and, contrary to Horace’s rule, (who says of a vaunting prefacer, ‘*Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?*’) with that he begins.

<sup>z</sup> It appears that Dr. Wall was about thirty-five years older than Mr. Gale.]

<sup>a</sup> [As Mr. Brown, and Mrs. Hall,

brought forward in Mr. Gale’s second letter, vol. ii. p. 56.]

For in an advertisement prefixed to his book, having taken notice that several great and worthy men (whom he names too) had given a favourable character of my book, he says, that he published these his Reflections ‘to inform the public, &c.— and to let those ‘learned gentlemen know, that they had been much too hasty in ‘their judgments; and that this history is not by far what they ‘take it to be.’ Is not this youth a likely man, think you, to be able to inform their judgment of any considerable thing? I set down this as a specimen of the arrogance you are to expect all through the book.

In the same advertisement he says that these Reflections (though published in 1711) were written in 1705 and 1706<sup>b</sup>. Suppose that. But when he saw in 1707 my second edition with some alterations, should he not have left out his needless remarks on those places of my first edition which I myself had altered in the second?

He there adds, that he had hoped that ‘a more learned advocate ‘would have been engaged.’ If Mr. Stennet were once desired or pitched on to answer my book, and it was devolved upon this man; it was an unhappy change both for the antipædobaptists and for me. For if he had answered at all, he would have said more to the purpose, would have used a more rational, modest, and candid way of seeking the truth; and I should have had far more Christian treatment. His note, that I did not reply to ‘Mr. Stennet’s Answer to ‘Mr. Russen,’ is frivolous; since I was not at all concerned to do it, nor ever thought of doing it. He mistakes the matter when he says, I was convinced by him of my mistake in charging him with a misrepresentation of the opinion of the followers of Gundulphus. We read Dr. Allix’s book (out of which the quotation was taken) together. The words were as I had said. All that I was convinced of was, that I should have spoken more respectfully of Mr. Stennet, (which I did in the contents of the second edition,) for that treatment his candour and ingenuous temper did deserve. The other ‘inadvertencies’ of mine, which he says Mr. Stennet rectified, were only some accounts of the present state, opinions, and usages of the English antipædobaptists, which must be had from themselves, and I desired him to give me. He gave me a truer and more skilful account of them than I could have from the antipædobaptists my neighbours, which I accordingly rectified in my second edition<sup>c</sup>.

Of his book the first pages, to p. 7, are a piece of his sermon on

<sup>b</sup> [But see a note to the introduction to vol. ii., where some reason is adduced for believing that at all events they were not written before 1707.]

<sup>c</sup> [See that edition, p. 430, &c., 453, &c., or the present, vol. ii. p. 533, &c., 560, &c.]



charity, moderation, candour, &c., which might pass well enough in the reading, provided one were not at the same time to read the rest of the book. But he that goes forward to read the next page, and so along, can hardly forbear calling to mind the amazement expressed by some people coming out of a church, where they had heard a good discourse, enforcing a certain virtue from a man who it seems was notoriously guilty of the contrary vice, ‘How can this man speak these things, and do as he does?’ For his first reflection on my book is at p. 8, where he reaches at a passage near the end thereof, (such a methodical answerer I have met with,) and having first observed that ‘a great many do traduce the antipædobaptists, as dangerous enemies to the state,’ he adds, concerning me, that ‘he has reason to fear that I am of the same mind too, though I endeavour to conceal it.’ What is his reason for this suspicion of me? ‘By my inserting among other things the scandalous story of Mr. Hicks, which I myself can scarce forbear confessing to be false.’

I had said at the place he refers to<sup>d</sup>, ‘The present state of the English antipædobaptists is this; they that are now are as commendable as any other sort of men are, for a sober and grave, quiet and peaceable way of living: they profess obedience to magistrates, and they will commonly express a dislike and abhorrence of those plunderings and other violences committed by some of their party, as well as by the rest of the army of that usurper aforesaid.’

I knew that there stood as an objection against this in the face of the world, the *Depositions* against many of their party, and the *Confessions* of some of them, as having been concerned in the Monmouth conspiracy. It was impossible (if one would speak to the purpose) not to take notice of this. If it had been some obscure story, he might have blamed me for mentioning it at all. But it was largely set forth in one of the most noted histories that was then (or is now) extant in the English tongue. I did however put in so many *ifs*, (as whether West swore true concerning what Roe told him; or if so, whether Hicks did ever say what Roe said he did, concerning the body of this people; or if so, whether Hicks himself did not give a reproachful account of them in his mentioning twenty thousand of them inclined to such a wickedness,) that I did in the main express my hopes that most of them were of another sentiment; which Mr. Gale expresses by this unhandsome turn, ‘he can scarce forbear confessing it to be false.’ I observed, moreover, that but two men of the twenty thousand appeared to have been guilty, and that

<sup>d</sup> [See vol. i. p. 533, 534, of this edition.]

they were of the forwardest to make a free confession. And besides, in my second edition, (which Mr. Gale must needs have seen before he printed,) having in the mean while understood from Mr. Stennet, that king Charles himself had, upon a hearing of Hicks' case in council, discharged him; I put in that also.

Yet still here he fears I am of the same mind as others that have an ill opinion of them. Who can help that? I know no cure for a man that will think I take him for a villain, when I declare the contrary. There must be an ill conscience, or ill nature in such a fear.

That which I guess is, that he does not think this of me; but would so represent me to the antipædobaptists as their enemy, to hinder them from regarding what I have written. So much difference there is between the temper of this man and of Mr. Stennet, who owned to me, that I had treated the antipædobaptists with more civility than most had done. And I remember my answer was, that it was indeed my aim so to do.

His next reflection, in the same page, is a great deal worse: not an ill-natured insinuation, but a downright untruth. I said, in the place he refers to, only this: 'that the way of setting up different churches for different opinions in lesser matters, (which way many people in Holland fell into, and has been imitated in another nation, and, as some say, outdone in it,) is the most contrary to the nature and design of Christianity of any thing that could be devised.' He alters the thing spoken of, and says, I assert 'that the forbearance the States of Holland allow, &c., is the most contrary,' &c. It is one thing to say schism is a great sin, another to determine that forbearing to punish it is always so. This is the man that had just ended his sermon about candour, truth, charity, &c.

I must not continue the course I have taken with these first two instances of his way of quoting, to set down my own words, and then his; but the reader (if he thinks his book or mine worth the reading) must make the comparison by looking in each himself. He will find many of a like nature with these two, which do not differ from Danvers' way. The very next is such, [page 5,] where he says, 'I cite in one paragraph Dr. Featley three times for setting forth the mischief of a toleration in any state:' if the reader turn to the place, he will see this to be false, as to the first two, (which are only historical, of antipædobaptism then beginning to spread, 1645,) and frivolous as to the third. For what hurt is there in saying, that 'in times of a general toleration' (he leaves out of my words,

*general*) ‘abundance of sects are apt to arise;’ especially when I add, (which he likewise leaves out,) ‘how necessary soever it might ‘be in other respects.’ Here he talks as if I justified the French king’s persecutions.

Page 6. His next quarrel with me comes to this in effect; that I lived where I do before the toleration, and in king Charles’ time. Who knows not that in those times the law was (and the courts and magistrates enforced it) that we should present, i. e. give an account to the church-court, of those that came not to church and communion? This I or the churchwardens did, not only in respect to the antipædobaptists or other dividers, but to such of our own church as were gross absenters. This he calls, ‘taking so much care to ‘perform his part with those who were endeavouring to plunder and ‘root out the antipædobaptists in his neighbourhood.’ And at other places<sup>e</sup> he names a man or a woman or two of Shoreham, who, about forty years ago, continuing obstinate in their schism, and contempt of all the authority of the church, were excommunicated. As if that were an ill thing. It looks as if he had at the time of his writing some prognostic of what doctrines, in derogation of all church authority and discipline of human excommunication, would come quickly to be preached in some of our pulpits, or as if he and some such late preachers had conferred notes. And it shews what pitiful stories he has been picking up; such and such a person were forty years ago excommunicated; they were, as far as I can remember the cases, such as sufficiently deserved it; and one of them (who is yet living, and, I believe, is he that furnisheth him with stories) upon other accounts besides his schism. Here he mightily commends the present toleration, but considers not that it was never intended to embolden such as he to fly in the face of the established church, as he does presently, at p. 6, where he has done with me for a while, and falls to railing at the clergy in general, or *many* of them, in such reproachful words as I shall not repeat.

Page 9. ‘You may expect a complete answer to Mr. Wall by a ‘very learned hand’] I do earnestly entreat and beseech the body of the antipædobaptists to take care that he be also a man of modesty and truth.

Page 10. ‘That he has not suffered a single instance to escape his ‘diligence’] By the very words of mine that he cites, it appears that I was not guilty of so much arrogance.

Page 10, 11. Here Mr. Gale is got out of his way, and into a talk of infant-baptism; which he seems not to have thought of

<sup>e</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 56.]

before since the titlepage. He blames me for not producing all the passages that make *against* it; and instances in a passage of Justin Martyr, which yet I did produce. But he complains that I said, 'It did not make directly *for* it, nor *against* it.' If he think otherwise, there he has it. I said, the Martyr 'had no occasion there 'to speak of the case of infants.' He thinks he had; and gives for a reason this far-fetched one; that if Christians had then baptized infants, an apologist would have mentioned that to the emperor, in order to obviate a slander which then lay on them, as if they did use to murder and eat children. Now this is an argument for the apologists to have used, which I confess I should never have thought of: and I cannot wonder that they did not, seeing there are so many more forcible ones which they did constantly use. As, namely, the severe law of God and of our Lord Christ against all murder and bloodshed whatsoever. Insomuch as many of them doubted whether it were lawful to kill an enemy in war. And they must be far from eating human blood, that held it unlawful to eat any blood at all. These arguments they do produce in their apologies; which are much more obvious and to the purpose than that which Mr. Gale would furnish them with.

Page 11, 12. He complains that I have been disingenuous in my citing a passage in St. Cyprian. Let the reader see if he can find where the fault is; I cannot. I owned it did not name 'infants 'particularly; and therefore I would but just mention it,' (having given before plain and direct passages out of St. Cyprian, to which he thinks fit to say nothing.) I owned also that St. Cyprian does at another place speak of communicating children of four or five years old. I said, it was plain that he here understands John iii. 5 to speak of baptism. And so it is by comparing the heads or contents with the chapter itself.

Page 13 is the seeking a quarrel where no handle was given. I cite Clemens' Constitutions; he cries out they are spurious, and proves it; and though I had put them no otherwise than in a chapter of spurious pieces by themselves, declared in the title to be spurious, and had there proved the spuriousness of them before him; yet, because I mentioned these spurious pieces at all, he calls it 'acting with the same artifice.' And observe his words, p. 13, 'They, like all the other boasted clear proofs, happen to be spurious.' Has not this man a good forehead?

Page 13—15. Having for a little while confined himself to cite passages picked up here and there out of my book, where he could not impute (that is, he should not have imputed) to me more than



my words would bear ; he here runs out into a freer way of giving the character of my temper in writing, without referring to any particular place, and tells the men of his opinion that I ‘ industriously take all advantages to blacken them,’ and many more such malicious and false expressions he uses, for which I think to call him to account by and by. He sets himself here to give a character of a slanderous writer, and (whether he had a glass before him I know not) he describes it very lively ; and then says, that ‘ if he can form any judgment, I have too near approached this method.’ Then he says, his reader will be surprised at so severe a charge from him, ‘ who has always so much talked of charity.’ If he have any reader that formerly had any opinion of his charity, or justice, or truth either, this surprise must indeed be expected. How does he take it off ? he assures the reader once again in words, that he is a man whom ‘ you must not upbraid with violating even the strictest rules of charity.’

Page 15—18. He takes upon him to censure my way of writing, that I often run out into too large digressions : what is that to him, or to the cause ? that may be an unskilfulness in writing ; but his business was to prove what he had said last, ‘ that I industriously took all advantages to blacken the antipædobaptists.’ He says, I thought by those digressions to ‘ serve ostentation, to display my reading, to shew abilities,’ and such prattle. That, sir, is the temper of boys and young men ; people under the infirmities of age are seldom inclined to that vanity. If I had aimed at that, I will tell you, Mr. Gale, what I would have done : I would have put at the end of my book a catalogue of the authors cited, &c. And if I had mentioned any of the school-books, Horace, Juvenal, Ovid, Terence, &c., I would set down pompously the editions of them. And if I had cited such a book, for example, as Dr. Grabe’s *Irenæus*, it should have been set down four times over ; once under J, twice under G, once under F ; and so Le Clerc’s *Patres Apostolici* nine or ten times<sup>f</sup>.

Page 18. What he says here of my reflecting on Mr. Stennet, looks as if he could not apprehend the sense of what he reads. I did not speak of his citing so largely Mr. Bossuet, (now bishop of Meaux,) as a digression from the subject, but as giving too much regard to what a papist says in a cause wherein they do generally speak for their interest against their conscience. And for what I say of ‘ the vein of fine language,’ Mr. Gale is the first reader that could, and will be the last that can, mistake my words so far as to

<sup>f</sup> [See the table of authors subjoined to Mr. Gale’s *Reflections*.]

say, I impute to Mr. Stennet the vanity of shewing that. All that I said was, that harangue of Mr. Bossuet had a vein of fine language, for which perhaps he might prize it, and count it worth a recital.

Page 18—28. Here he brings a long charge against me for my style, that it has been too censorious and sharp against some learned and great men that are pædobaptists; concerning which, having already said what I thought needful, and taken to myself the blame due to me from them, I need add here no more than to ask him again, what is this to him or to the cause? If I, being but a mean person, have been too presuming and arrogant toward greater men, forgetting the respect due to their character, I have been served just in my kind; for I also have lived to have a youth, without any respect to my age, or to the office that I bear in the church, (though unworthy,) or to the church in which it is borne, or to the opinion of great men therein, (who have taken my mean endeavours in good part<sup>h</sup>), treat me very dirtily. But is this the best service he can do to his cause? If he has been employed by the antipædobaptists in the defence of their opinions; may they not say to him, ‘You defend Grotius, Mr. Le Clerc, Chrysostom, and ‘this or that father, or bishop, who are no friends of ours; but ‘when will you remember us?’ Among the poets he quotes to no purpose, he should have thought of that scrap of Martial, ‘De tribus ‘capellis.’

He talks of another man that is to answer my book; I hope that other will keep close to the main subject of it; for this man has meddled with every thing else, and has often reached for cavils where no occasion was given. I mentioned the name of Archbishop Tillotson twice in my book<sup>i</sup>. In one of them it is written Archbishop, as it should be, in the other, Bishop Tillotson. This our author calls *quarrelling* with that prelate; and sets it so in his table of contents. Does not any man in hasty writing or speaking, say often, ‘Bishop Ussheri,’ ‘Bishop Laud,’ &c., without any intention of disrespect? Are these things matter for a book?

Concerning some of the others, he makes my words worse than they are. I said that Gregory Nazianzen probably gave his opinion of deferring a child’s baptism (if he were well) till three years, in some compliance with his father’s practice. He makes me represent the son ‘persuading men against his conscience,’ &c., he

g [See a note, containing the relative ages of Dr. Wall and Mr. Gale, at p. 359, above.]

h [See this alluded to above, at p. 360.]

i [See part ii. p. 585 and 659.]

j [See the note at vol. i. p. 343.]

makes me call St. Chrysostom, 'a leaden headed logician.' I only said of one argument of his, that it was (though golden-mouthed oratory) but leaden-headed logic. There is a great difference between these two sayings. And even that was altered in the second edition, of which it was unfair in Mr. Gale to take no notice. He says,

Page 20, That I make the Gregories 'singular in the practice of 'deferring baptism for some time; and yet a few lines after do confess it was very common at that time.' It is hard to find a reader eyes; and as hard to keep this man from cavilling at what he sees to be otherwise than he represents. I said, the Gregories were singular in practising or advising the delay of a child's baptism till two or three years, as *by principle*. Of the many that I speak of afterward, my words are, that they delayed and put it off something longer than ordinary, not out of *principle*, that so they ought to do, but out of negligence and a procrastination which they themselves owned to be blamable. Is there any contradiction in this? And yet he brings the same again, p. 26.

Page 24. He would have it to be a contradiction, that I say, part i. chap. 11, that Grotius went about to disprove infant-baptism from a passage in Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 40; and yet do, part ii. chap. 2. [vol. i. p. 353.] repeat his words, that 'all that he had 'brought is of no force to prove that infant-baptism should be 'denied, but only to shew the liberty, antiquity, and difference of 'the custom.' Now both of these are consistent enough. For Grotius does (as is common) produce the arguments, or quotations on both sides (those that make *for* and those that make *against* it) by themselves. And among the latter he has brought a scrap of that fortieth Oration of Gregory (which in reality is all strong and positive *for* infant-baptism) among the arguments *against* it. And though he, having pretended to weigh the arguments on both sides, does at last split the matter in dispute, judging it to be indifferent; yet still the arguments on one side taken by themselves are brought to *disprove* it, as the others are to *prove* it. And my blame of his conduct is, that he set this quotation on one side, which should have stood on the other. And Mr. Gale's excuse that he makes for him, p. 26, makes the matter worse. For he says, 'Gregory might 'intend such children as missed of baptism through their parents' 'fault;' (and so I say he certainly did.) Does this excuse Grotius for putting such a quotation among those that make against infant-baptism? Or does it not rather aggravate his mistake?

For the criticism he talks of, and for which he tells you he

looked into his Dictionary, p. 42, ('have it not in their power to 'receive it') as I said, or ('are not in a capacity to receive it') as he says, it is not worth the discussing; because Mr. Gale himself has not the confidence (though he have a good one) to say that Gregory means any other incapacity than this; that they in their infancy cannot procure themselves to be baptized, and must be without baptism unless their parents help them to it; and so it is not their own but their parents' fault if they miss of it; and therefore he thinks their punishment will be only *pœna damni*.

Page 27. The case is the same as to the contradiction that he would here find in what I say of the words of the sixth canon of the council of Neocæsarea; in which Grotius, the first of all men, found an argument against infant-baptism. He curtails my words to make them appear contradictory. I said, the words of the canon are, 'as to the main of the determination,' applicable to either of the senses there recited, viz. (as I there explain it.) The bishops, whether they had held *for* or *against* infant-baptism, would have determined that the woman might be baptized. But whereas from a phrase in the last clause Grotius would draw an argument that they held it unlawful to baptize an infant, as having no choice of will, I shewed the propriety of the phrase to be such as gives no ground to that interpretation of it. Now this man, leaving out the distinction I plainly expressed<sup>i</sup> 'of the main of the determination,' and of 'the propriety of phrase in the last clause,' represents me, both here and over again afterward, as contradicting myself. And he speaks of my fastening upon Grotius foul dealing in the matter, which I did not do in this matter of his criticism; but in his misrepresenting the words of Balsamon, of which Mr. Gale speaks next, p. 27.

Page 27. I did indeed say, 'I would set down Balsamon's words 'at large, that the reader might see if he can acquit that great man ' (viz. Grotius) of the crime of prevarication.' And I do still question whether he can. For when Balsamon says, that the child in the womb cannot be baptized, nor accounted as baptized, by his mother's baptism; for this reason among others, 'because at baptism every one's own profession' (or promise) 'is necessary; and 'an embryo (or child unborn) cannot make that necessary profession;' and he adds in almost the next words, 'an embryo cannot 'have sponsors;' 'but infants' (meaning when they are born into the world) 'do promise by their sponsors, and being actually baptized,'

<sup>i</sup> [Namely, at part i. p. 95.]



&c. For Grotius to set down, among his arguments against infant-baptism, the former part of this paragraph, and omit the latter, whether it were prevarication, or a very great oversight in not reading the whole place, let the reader judge. Which soever it was, it was not so bold as Mr. Gale's attempt on the same place is (nor did Grotius, or any man of liberal education, ever venture on such an one). For he, when he comes here, p. 29, to account for these latter words, puts this shameless affront upon his reader, to say, 'Balsamon, or perhaps somebody else, has subjoined some words, 'which allow children may be brought to baptism by sponsors.' This outdoes Danvers: for he, when he rejected, as spurious, a quotation which he did not like, rejected it all; all the book, chapter, epistle, &c. But here is a defender of a cause in a new-fashioned way. He will take one part of a paragraph (which by itself may be drawn to his opinion) to be the author's own; and if the other part explain the author's meaning, will throw it away.

As for the shuffle that he makes about the word *κατατίθεται*, he must look into his dictionary again. For when, speaking of the baptizing of infants, an author says, that 'the infants *κατατίθεται* by their 'sponsors;' it can signify nothing but *do promise* or *do consent*. And *συγκατατίθεμαι* does commonly signify *consent*, as 2 Cor. ii. 16; and Origen, *Comm. in Joann.* p. 115, (in a discourse of which Mr. Gale, p. 242, quotes a part,) *συγκατατιθέμενοι διὰ τῆς σιωπῆς*, 'giving consent by their silence.'

But Zonaras, he thinks still, was an antipædobaptist. Zonaras writes just as Balsamon does in that former part, (as to the niceties Mr. Gale employs about the translation of their words, it is true, what he guesses, that I had only the Latin of their comments before me, he had the Greek; but I find the sense to be so perfectly the same as to any thing that may affect our subject, that I will not enter into any such trifling dispute; let the reader take his translation or mine, I am content;) their words are on the same canon, they were of the same church, and wrote in the same age, the twelfth century: so that when they do both speak of the promise or profession made by every one at his baptism; and one of them explains what is meant by that, viz. the profession which infants make by their sponsors; we cannot doubt but that is the meaning of the other also. Especially when we know that that church at that time did without any control hold infant-baptism to be necessary. If Balsamon or Zonaras (who had, as Mr. Gale observes, each of them great places and offices) had been of another opinion, it had not been safe for them to publish it. Constantinople was not as Holland and

England are now, where any one may preach or write any new or heterodox thing that comes in their mind.

Page 29. To what I urge, (that Pelagius and St. Austin, who must have heard of this council, do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that were against infant-baptism,) Mr. Gale, according to a particular way that he has of giving a man the lie in other words, when there is no occasion for it, says, I should not have said as I did, ‘but which had been truer,’ &c.

Pelagius’ words in the place I refer to<sup>m</sup> are, ‘Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise, &c., which is a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked here-tic say. For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the ‘gospel,’ &c. And for St. Austin’s words, Mr. Gale owns that they are, that he never heard of any that denied that baptism was given for remission of sins. And if he look into the place again, he will find that St. Austin is there speaking of the case of *infants*, and that the remission of sins he speaks of is the remission of *original sin*: for so are the words; ‘When I was at Carthage, I heard a cursory ‘discourse of some people, who said, that infants are not baptized ‘for that reason, that they may receive remission of sins; but that, ‘&c. I was startled at the novelty,’ &c. This is in the same paragraph where the words are; ‘I do not remember that I ever heard ‘any other thing from any Christians, &c. I do not remember that ‘I ever read otherwise in any writer,’ &c. And the very title of the book is, ‘Of the Guilt and Forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism of ‘Infants.’ Would any man, pretending to decency, except Mr. Gale, give a man the lie for saying, that these men do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that denied that infants were to be baptized?

Page 30. From a saying of Bilius, which I produce, he thinks I am hard put to it, when I profess myself to believe that ‘that was not his settled opinion.’ If I had been hard put to it, had it not been easy for me to omit the mention of it? Did ever any one in this controversy produce this place before me? Mr. Gale, I believe, cannot tell. But some other antipædobaptists do know, that in this and several other instances I have out of authors ancient and modern brought some passages, making against infant-baptism, which had not been observed before by any managers of that cause; and that this, which I met with by chance in Bilius, is one of them. It had been safe and easy to have left it out. But I think still what I said there to be true, that it is not

<sup>m</sup> [See part i. p. 279.]

likely that this was Bilius' settled opinion ; he being an abbot of the church of Rome. Let those that have leisure search his works, if they please. I count it not worth so much pains.

The other two instances that he gives there need no other answer, but that any one read his book and mine.

Page 30. He says, ' I insinuate that they countenance at least, ' and have among them, some who deny the human nature of our ' Lord Christ,' &c. He protests, ' He does not know so much as a ' single man,' &c., and that ' such an one can be no Christian.' What I said<sup>n</sup> was, ' Some of them (but I think it is but few in ' England) do hold that error which has of old been attributed to ' the antipædobaptists of Germany, and is said to be still held by the ' Minnists of Holland ; that Christ took not flesh of the Virgin ' Mary,' &c.

I do there urge against this opinion this consequence ; that then Christ ' is not properly man ; as not being made of a woman, nor of ' the seed of David°.' How far the Minnists, or others of that opinion, do own this consequence, I know not. As for the opinion itself, I said there were but few in England of it ; and I believe he will not maintain the contrary, but that there are, or lately have been, some. And how far he does by these words deny the Dutch antipædobaptists to be Christians, let him consider. And let the reader judge what occasion there is for that charge of *spitefulness* which he brings against me here ; or for that with which he begins his next chapter, saying, ' What can be more unfair than to represent and judge of a whole body (of men) by the odd singular ' opinions of a few particular men in it ? ' It is unfair to do so ; and it is not true to say, I did so. I said, there were *but few* among them of this opinion.

## CHAP. II.

Page 32. Here having vented his spleen upon bishop Bramhall, (as if it were a heresy to assert the real presence ; or as if the confession of faith of one hundred churches of the antipædobaptists did not own and declare that worthy receivers do *really and indeed* receive and feed upon Christ crucified,) and upon Mr. Dodwell and bishop Ussher, he enlarges his foam against the present clergy, which they that love to hear such language may read if they please.

<sup>n</sup> [Vol. i. p. 540.]

<sup>o</sup> [Ibid. p. 542.]

Page 33. He owns, there are perhaps among the antipædobaptists ‘some ill-meaning people;’ and I think he has convinced every body that there is one at least.

Page 34. Speaking of my ‘mischievous insinuations,’ he instances in my ‘silly excuse’ for Mr. Baxter. If the reader turn to it, (it is in part ii. chap. 9. § 3 of my book,) he will see no harm or mischief meant to any body in it. Nor in what I say of the antipædobaptists ‘maintaining their poor liberally,’ (which is part ii. chap. 8. sect. 6,) for which I say there, ‘they are particularly commended.’ He does not let his reader know where these sayings of mine are, but to prove the mischief of them recites a saying of mine, above three hundred pages from either of them, where I am speaking of separatists in general; and applies it to the antipædobaptists, of whom I had no thought at that place.

Page 35. He uses more foul language than ordinary. That the things I say of the antipædobaptists are ‘so notoriously false, that ‘he admires any man, especially one of my order, could,’ &c. Here a reader would expect some great falsehood of mine. All that he instances in is this; first he enlarges on this topic, how ‘black ‘heretical a tenet Socinianism is with most people;’ (but he does not here say much of his own dislike of it;) and then adds, that I say, ‘they have many Socinians among them;’ that is true, (save that he leaves out the word *underhand*: my word is, *underhand Socinians*;) he adds, ‘insinuating as if we countenanced them.’ That is false; for I say the direct contrary, as will appear presently. But here he brings over again what he had said, p. 49, (to which I answered just now,) and quotes some words of mine at a very distant place from the other, which any one that will turn to the place will see are not spoken of the antipædobaptists in general, or the Socinians in general; but only of those that to their Socinianism, or denial of Christ’s divinity, do add a denial that he took flesh of the Virgin Mary; of whom I say there are but few in England.

Page 36. He says I accuse the antipædobaptists of holding those very opinions which I at another place (which he there recites) do own they endeavour to root out, meaning *Socinianism*. Now I never accuse them any farther than by saying, ‘they have many ‘underhand *Socinians* among them.’ And at the other place, ‘Socinians they have some, that creep in among them.’ And is not this (if he had recited my words true) consistent with the other, that ‘they that profess it openly are rejected from their commu-



‘nion?’ So that the crime of false accusation returns on himself. He knows well enough that their own members, those of the *general assembly*, and those of the *general association*, have reflected on each other on account of the *Socinian* tenets, at a much higher rate than I have done.

Page 36. ‘Pelagianism, and the holding the mortality of the ‘soul, are very falsely imputed.’] If he mean imputed to *all of them*, it is false to say I imputed these tenets to them; if he mean to *any of them*, he will not have the face to deny that some parties of them do deny original sin, and some do hold a sleep of the soul till the resurrection. ‘Mortality of the soul’ is his own word.

Page 37. Here is the first place where our author begins to argue; so that the reader might hope that he had done with his personal cavils and reproaches; but if he hope so, he will afterward find himself mistaken. From hence to p. 57 he labours to overthrow the argument of my last chapter; which I confess I valued the most of any, because it tends to peace and unity.

I endeavoured to shew, that which way of baptism soever be the fittest, yet the difference between the present contending parties, being not a fundamental one, is not of that moment as to justify their separation, and renouncing one another’s communion. He makes these exceptions against the plea that I here use.

1. First, that I did not give a definition of *schism*, or of such separation as is *sinful*. One that writes a brief dissuasive from drunkenness, adultery, or any other sin, does not usually enter into a methodical treatise of the definition of those sins, because he reckons them commonly known, and so did I. Yet I shewed from St. Paul’s discourse, Rom. xiv, and part of xv, that he earnestly commands Christians to *receive one another*, and not to separate for differences in opinion or practice, which are not such wherein *the kingdom of God* does consist; or, which are not (as I there expressed it) fundamental. And a plain consequence of that is, that to separate from an established church for differences that are not so, is a *sinful* separation or schism.

But he complains that I did not give a catalogue of fundamentals. That, I hope, was not, nor ever will be, expected of me; but I endeavoured to shew, that the difference between the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists is not such. I mentioned there the severe law of the gospel against separations, divisions, &c. And whereas the gospel itself makes some exceptions to that general law I having observed, that some exceptions particularly mentioned in a law, do strengthen that law in all cases not excepted, proceeded to recite four

instances of excepted cases; and that they were all that I could find in Scripture; and that he that separates from any church upon any ground except one of those four, ought to be sure that he find his ground in Scripture. To all which this wretched answerer of a book says nothing; and if he could have said any thing to purpose, it had been more material than any thing he has said.

I recited also the acknowledgments of several pædobaptists and anti-pædobaptists, that this difference is not fundamental; and for the anti-pædobaptists, the public confession of one hundred churches of them. He answers not a word, but in effect condemns their opinion.

Page 37. He sets his own talent in logic to work. He defines *schism*; he makes the *genus* of it to be, ‘the occasioning of schism.’ One is bad enough, and the other very bad. But as rebellion, and the giving occasion to rebellion, are two things, so it is in schism.

Page 39. He defines *fundamentals*: they are ‘such things as are ‘plainly necessary;’ which is just as much as to say, ‘as are plainly ‘fundamental.’ This is the man that Dr. Whitby calls, ‘the very ‘learned Mr. Gale.’

P. 38. He says, that as the protestants separated from the church of Rome, so if any church ‘degenerate into dangerous errors and ‘corruptions,’ &c. Should he not here have restrained the signification of that general word *dangerous* to the more limited sense of *fundamental*, as I had expressed it; or ‘errors in points plainly ‘necessary,’ as he himself settles it?

Secondly, he answers, p. 40, that beside those things that are fundamental or necessary to the constituting a true *Christian*, some other things are necessary to the constituting of a *church*. As, that it have the ecclesiastical offices performed by ministers lawfully called to preach, give the sacraments, &c.

I do not disallow of the distinction: but who could have thought it to be of any use here to the anti-pædobaptists? had ever any of them before this man the forehead to deny that the church of England has ecclesiastical officers to this purpose? He says,

Page 53, ‘We do not assert so much; yet to some it will, it may ‘be, seem a little probable, that she may perhaps have no bishops, ‘presbyters, &c., no lawful ordinations.’] He does not pretend to find any fault in the manner or circumstances of the ordinations in the church of England, nor to urge or shew any fault in the derivation of the ministerial authority by succession from the apostles. And it had been indeed stark madness for one who can give no account

at all, by whom or by what hands the power or commission of their *elders* is derived from them, to touch on that point. On the contrary, he would have it believed, that neither they nor we do count that necessary, or of any use; for at p. 41 he speaks of those whom he calls 'the more judicious part of the church of England, as 'having given up the chimæra of an uninterrupted succession.' If he and those *judicious* men conferred notes, they should have bid him say, 'We will quickly give it up;' and not have suffered him to pass for the first preacher of that doctrine. They should have reckoned that honour to themselves. Now he is a leader, and they tamely follow him.

But as to his argument here, since he does not lay the blame on the manner of the ordinations; it is plain that all the meaning he has in saying, we have perhaps no bishops, no presbyters, &c., is, that they have never been baptized; and therefore cannot ordain, or be ordained. So that after a long talk about the difference between 'fundamental to a person's being a Christian, and fundamental to a 'church,' the question returns to just no more than it was; whether the age or manner of receiving baptism be fundamental to a person. For if it be not, he brings no new reason of its being fundamental to a church.

When he boasts, p. 51, that all the reasons I bring for the anti-pædobaptists joining in communion with other Christians in all things that they can, 'are sufficiently answered by the foregoing 'distinction between fundamentals of religion, and fundamentals in 'the constitution of a true Christian church;' and says of the age or time of receiving baptism, 'It is a fundamental with us in the 'constitution of a church;' the distinction here is of no use. For these circumstances of baptism can be fundamental to a church no farther than they are fundamental (or of the essence) to each particular man's baptism. If the baptism he received in infancy is sufficient to denominate him a Christian; it puts him in a capacity (if nothing else hinder) of receiving orders. And if Mr. Gale cannot truly say in the name of the anti-pædobaptists in general, these circumstances are fundamental *with us* to the being of a Christian (as he cannot; for they deny them to be so); then neither is it true which he says in their names; they are 'a fundamental 'with us in the constitution of a church.'

And indeed here he deduces all the reason of our being *no church* from our having *no baptism*. For having premised, 'Perhaps some 'may carry this so far as to question whether such a congregation 'is a visible church. For if, as I will prove hereafter, her (the

‘ church of England’s) baptism is not true; that is, if she have no ‘ baptism,’ &c., then he deduces what I recited of ‘ her having no ‘ bishops,’ &c.; and, p. 53, sets forth my persuasion to the antipædobaptists to join the church, as absurd; ‘ telling us, we ought to ‘ unite with persons we are persuaded are not baptized.’ Which outrage of defiance is what none, or but few, of the antipædobaptists beside himself are guilty of.

If a *toleration* be a good thing, we see what mischievous effects are produced by the abuse of it in the minds, and by the mouths and pens, of proud and arrogant men. The church and nation of England has so long tolerated these congregations with their leaders, (under the notion of weak, misled, schismatical, improperly ordained, but yet still well-meaning, quiet, and modest men; such as would be glad and content with their own liberty, and would not affront the established church and government,) so long, I say, till at last she herself has no bishops, presbyters, &c., is no church, and her people no Christians. If such antipædobaptists, or other dissenters, as are really modest men, ever have the toleration taken from them by that power which lately allowed it them<sup>q</sup>, they will have reason to thank these few men of fury and impudence, who do render it intolerable, by their flying in the face of the established church and religion. Holland is the noted place for toleration; and yet this would not have been borne with there.

3. A third plea that he uses is, that a church may be right in all fundamentals, and yet it does not follow that it is a duty to join or communicate with her. For some of the dissenters in England, and (as I, he says, have granted) the antipædobaptists particularly, are right in fundamentals; and yet the members of the established church do not think themselves bound to join them.

This man answers a chapter, and has not read it. I did in that chapter, sect. 5, give four instances, wherein the Scripture forbids us to join any Christians that are in any of those cases. The second is, false doctrine in fundamentals. And the fourth is this: ‘ If a ‘ church be schismatical, i. e. in a state of unjustifiable division or ‘ separation from another church, from which she has withdrawn ‘ herself.’ For which I cite there Rom. xvi. 17, where the Apostle commands us to avoid such. This answers all the trifling which here, p. 42, &c., takes up several pages, pretending to shew that my argument, of agreement in fundamentals, would as soon make it necessary for the established churches to join those that have sepa-

<sup>q</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 55, 128.]



rated from them, as for the separators to return to the established churches.

Page 44. He at last allows some little difference between the plea of the church of England and that of the dissenters; in that the former 'is established by the civil authority of the land.' This sort of men never make any thing of ecclesiastic authority; but do, as St. Peter says, 2nd Ep. ii. 10, and St. Jude, ver. 10, *despise that government or dominion*; (in which presumption they have been lately hardened by doctrines preached where they ought not;) therefore he mentions only the civil: and to that he attributes very little. He says, in the next page, [p. 46,] 'If there is no other reason—the crime can be very little, if at all, less in the latter than in the former,' i. e. in the church than in the dissenters. This is what many of them think; but this man speaks it out, directly against the Scripture, which lays a great stress on our obedience to governors.

And he forgets all the other differences: as that the said church had been established long before their ways were thought on. She did not come out from them, but they from her. For the antipædobaptists, I had shewed in that chapter, and in chap. 8, that their eldest separate churches in England were not yet of the age of a man, viz. seventy years. Besides that, in case there was as yet no established church, but it were now to be established by majority of voices, (which in such a case of agreement in fundamentals, and difference in lesser opinions, would be necessary for avoiding schism,) even so, he may be sure, it would not be antipædobaptists; nor is there, nor ever was, a national church of that opinion in the world<sup>r</sup>.

These and other things, which shew on which side the guilt of schism lies, he omits; and speaks only of the civil power. And that, as it may seem, only that he might cast a slur upon it, and shew how little he regarded it.

Page 45. Whereas he urges here, that I 'must take this along with me as the consequence; that if any of the dissenting parties should become the national church by the civil power; they would have a right to the same privileges; and that the same may be as justly claimed by the presbyterian churches in Scotland, and those of the United Provinces,—Prussia, Sweden, and Denmark;' he knows that I, for my part, have taken that consequence along with me, and yielded to it thus far; that in all such countries, an inhabitant is to hold communion in all things that he can,

<sup>r</sup> [See this argued at part ii. chap. 8. p. 504, &c.]

provided there be no idolatry, false doctrine in the fundamentals, &c., nor no wicked thing required of him to profess or practise. As for what he urges of English churches built abroad, meaning, I suppose, Rotterdam; it may be, it is for the use of such as understand not Dutch, or forty other reasons unknown to me. He would have me answer for some great men in England, that refused communion at Charenton. I know not their case nor their reasons, and so cannot either censure or justify their actions. Save that, I think I have heard or read, that the noble lord Clarendon<sup>s</sup> (whom he mentions for one) did it, because there they held correspondence with, and adhered to, and justified the rebels in England. Which, if so, was doubtless a good reason. For as I (in the chapter which Mr. Gale is here answering) did allow at sect. 5,<sup>t</sup> that ‘if a church ‘teach doctrines encouraging any wickedness, as fornication,’ &c., it is a just cause to shun her communion; under that &c., any one would mean *rebellion* for one. Which God preserve any church hereabouts from teaching. Some, that call themselves of our church, have made a scandalous beginning. And, which is worse, have gone about to justify it from those very places of God’s word which assign damnation to it.

Page 46. He takes refuge under the plea of *occasional* instead of *constant* communion; which plea was much in vogue among the shifting place-hunters at the time of his writing; but now every body is ashamed of it. And the antipædobaptists generally (as well as the honest men among other dissenters,) did scorn it then. So that his pleading for it was not for their use; but shews the strength of his stomach to digest any doctrine that is for convenience. That is his word, ‘communicate together as should seem convenient;’ *lege*, for holding a place.

Then for five pages he answers by recriminating. That if the dissenters are to blame in separating for things not fundamental, yet the church is likewise to blame for imposing them; since they prove an occasion for the others’ separating. How far some churches may be to blame on this account, I know not. The church of England imposes the least, in order to lay-communion, of any church, I think, in the world. Nothing but the professions of baptism, and the Catechism, as I in that chapter shewed. And for ceremonies in prayer, &c., there have often been broad intimations given to the dissenters, that if they could agree on what would satisfy them, the church would receive any reasonable proposals. But what can satisfy so disagreeing parties? At the end of this answer,

<sup>s</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 45.]

<sup>t</sup> [See part ii. p. 671.]

p. 49, he has forgot the case we are speaking of. He says, ‘ If the ‘ church by arbitrary impositions break in on fundamental laws,’ &c.; which is contrary to the hypothesis; for we are speaking only of men, or societies, agreeing in fundamentals.

Page 50, &c. He recites how I argue upon a supposition, that the antipædobaptists are in the right in their opinion; and yet ought not to separate. Which argument he represents absurd, and makes it so, by altering the supposition or case that I put. I put no other case but this; suppose they are in the right in thinking their way of baptizing by dipping at adult age to be the better or more fitting way. I did (as plainly as a man can speak) distinguish between two sorts of them. As sect. 7.<sup>u</sup> ‘ Some men of ‘ that way do think, that all such as have no other baptism but ‘ what was given in infancy and by affusion are no Christians;—I ‘ hope there are not many such. And Mr. Stennet reckons it a ‘ slander on the antipædobaptists,’ &c. And such I there advise to read what I had written before, sect. 6, to prove that the point in debate between the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists is not a fundamental article. And there I had owned, that if it be, they must indeed separate in their communion; and the guilt will lie on those that are in the error. But had shewn that the far greater part of them are of the other sort, or of the other opinion, viz. that it is not a fundamental difference; but though they think their way of baptizing the more regular and fitting, do yet allow that men baptized in infancy are Christians. And I pleaded, that these, supposing that they were in the right in that opinion, that their way of baptizing were the fittest, and though they continued in that opinion, and did not baptize their children in infancy, yet ought to hold communion with other Christians in other things.

Now Mr. Gale here owns plainly of which of the said two sorts he himself is, (of the worst for certain, if one be worse than another,) viz. that his opinion (or ‘ notion,’ as he calls it) is, that none are Christians (he calls it, ‘ true members of the Christian ‘ church’) but themselves; (the very thing which Mr. Stennet disclaims with abhorrence;) and speaks as if I had put the case that those of ‘ his notion’ were in the right, and yet ought to come to the communion of the church. If he had not minded what I said, he takes me for an idiot. And if he had, he does wilfully pervert my words, [p. 51.] ‘ Our author,’ says he, ‘ supposes us in the right in ‘ all this. He argues on a supposition that we are in the right.’ Whom does he mean by *us* and *we*? I meant only the charitable

<sup>u</sup> [Vol. i. p. 685.]

sort, (who take us to be Christians, and we them,) that they should communicate in prayers and the other sacrament, even putting the case they were in the right in refusing to bring their own children to baptism in infancy. As for the other uncharitable sort, I question whether they are fit to communicate any where. For whatever becomes of the question, whether he that is not dipped be no Christian; it is out of question, that he that in his debates about dipping or pouring has lost charity is none. But, as I said before, I hope there are not many of them such. This poor blunder or fallacy he brings, I think, ten times in his book, and builds his demonstrations upon it, and desires his friend ‘always to remember ‘it.’ [p. 52, 53.] ‘All that I say is to proceed on that supposition; ‘none are baptized but believers dipped, (which you remember, sir, ‘Mr. Wall always supposes.)’ I never supposed any such thing. Nor could any understand me so, but some gross or malicious perverter of words.

Some other sophistical turns he gives to the phrases as he goes along in this argument; which every one that is exercised in arguing sees as soon as he reads them. For the sake of the unskilful they may be briefly noted.

Page 51. ‘Not of the essence, but wholly indifferent’] It does not follow that a circumstance which is not of the essence, is therefore wholly indifferent. Dipping may be more fitting than pouring, and yet not absolutely necessary, or of the essence.

Page 52. ‘Alterations change the thing’] Alterations in circumstances do not change the essence.

Ibid. ‘A subject and a mode is necessary; therefore the true subject, a *believer*, and the true mode, *dipping*, is necessary to *true* ‘baptism’] There is a distinction known to every body that studies logic, between *true* metaphysically and essentially, and *true* morally. An honest man is the only true man morally; but every man is a *true* man metaphysically, i. e. he is truly a man. So for churches; one may be much better ordered, or *true*; another faulty, and yet, if not corrupted in fundamentals, is a true church, or truly a church. So for the modes of baptism, or of receiving the other sacrament; one may be fitter, and yet the other does not cease to be *true*, and the baptism or Lord’s Supper so given or taken to be true baptism or communion. This other poor fallacy also runs through all his book. As at p. 42, ‘true church,’ &c.

Page 53. He brings the definition of a church from our nineteenth article; ‘Wherein the sacraments are duly administered.’ And though he recite, yet does not sufficiently mind the last



words ; ‘ In all things that *of necessity* are requisite to the same. Else, any difference of mode in administering either of the sacraments, in any two churches, would make one of them to be no true church. And so in the next words, ‘ baptism duly performed.’ That which is performed in a way which is not the most decent or fitting of all, may yet be duly performed ‘ in all things that of necessity are requisite.’

Page 53. He quotes Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, cap. 15. ‘ Baptismum, ‘ cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent.’ ‘ They who are ‘ not duly baptized are certainly not baptized.’ No man of tolerable sincerity, or reputation for it, would have brought that saying of Tertullian to the purpose that he here does. Tertullian is there speaking of the baptism of such heretics as do not baptize in the name of the Trinity, nor believe it. His words are, ‘ Non idem Deus ‘ est nobis et illis ; nec unus Christus, id est, idem ; ideoque nec ‘ baptismus unus, quia non idem ; quem cum rite non habeant, sine ‘ dubio non habent.’ ‘ They and we have neither the same God, nor ‘ the same Christ, and so not the same baptism ; which since they ‘ have not aright, they have it not at all.’ To quote a scrap of this, and apply it to those that do, both of them, use the Christian baptism, differing only in mode or time, is the property of one who aims, not to inform his readers, but to blind them.

Page 54. ‘ Baptism in general, without some particular modes or other, cannot be conceived or administered.’] True. But some modes or circumstances are absolutely determined and expressly enjoined by our Saviour ; as that it should be with *water*, and in the form appointed. And yet some other circumstances, as of the age, and of the washing either of the whole body, or part, may be not absolutely limited.

Ibid. ‘ If only that form is true which our Saviour prescribes ; ‘ then only those subjects and that mode are lawful which he ‘ specifies.’] If our Saviour had so specified the subject and mode of baptism as to have said expressly, ‘ baptize only the adult, and ‘ only by dipping,’ in like manner as he specifies the *form* in which we are to baptize ; the one had been as necessary as the other.

Page 55. ‘ In short, we refuse to communicate with the church of ‘ England, for the same reason that she refuses to communicate ‘ with persons she cannot esteem baptized.’] This is indeed short, full, and open. But then it is a desperate uncharitable tenet : like to that of the Donatists and papists ; none saved, no Christians but themselves. What a poor price of our Saviour’s blood does this man set forth ! None baptized in his name for many hundred

years, but a few of the Albigenes at the year 1100, and a few straggling people in Holland and England since 1522. Even those in Holland are most, or many of them, cut off. For they do commonly use affusion. He in this point forsakes most of those of his own communion. For they own it not to be fundamental, as I shewed<sup>x</sup>. The governors, when they tolerated these men, little thought they should come to be censured as unbaptized.

Page 56. 'The church has no power over those that withdraw 'from her communion.'] She has power to declare them excommunicated, and so leave them under the consequences of that sentence, when they do in effect excommunicate themselves by withdrawing from her communion. Or else all those canons for excommunicating schismatics that would not return to the unity of the church, (whereof there are many in general councils,) were made to no purpose. Here he would make me a criminal, (for he is now returned to his vein of personal reproaches,) because I insinuated, he says, [p. 56,] that 'the act of toleration does not (he makes it *cannot*) tie up the church's hands from any proceedings of that 'nature,' viz. of presenting to the spiritual court, and excommunicating those that are obstinate; but does only set aside temporal punishments. The common lawyers are the best judges of the sense of the act. As for my opinion, it is the same as it was. And as I there cited Bishop Stillingfleet, that 'it is a fundamental right of 'any church to exclude out of itself such as by the laws of a Christian society are fit to be shut out:' so I do here cite a greater author, who, Rom. xvi. 17, commands that *those that cause divisions be marked and avoided*: which the church may now command to be done. He does not indeed say any thing of their loss of money, or goods, &c., neither did I.

Ibid. He repeats again what he had said, p. 6, that thirty or forty years ago, I or the churchwardens did present one Katherine Hall and one Joseph Brown, antipædobaptists, who continuing obstinate were excommunicated. Does he think that in forty years' time there has not been occasion to present several? some for schism, some for fornication, &c.; some of whom were excommunicated, some did penance, &c. Why has he not picked up all their names, and published their excommunications to the world? He says, I afterward asked pardon of the latter of these two. I remember something of it: one part of the presentment was; that he refused to repair a chancel that belonged to the house he lived in; and I questioned afterward, whether the repairs should lie on him

<sup>x</sup> [See vol. i. chap. ii. sect. 5. p. 672—675.]

or his landlord, and in that doubt asked his pardon. Are not these memorable things to be printed in a book of controversy on a question of religion? and for which he should write in the contents of his book, ‘Mr. Wall a friend to persecutions for religion,’ and should run on to the end of the chapter with an impertinent harangue about the British government, French dragoons, Judas and Pilate; and how ‘close it touches him [poor man!] to see one ‘whose function is to serve at the altar, &c., of a complexion so repugnant to meekness,’ &c.? Whereas I meddled not with any of the temporal punishments which any of them suffered, (as the law then was,) by fines, forfeitures, &c., and presented dissenters no otherwise than those of our own persuasion, who scandalously absented themselves from prayers and sacraments; that they might be required either to join duly in them, or else be authoritatively cut off from them, and avoided: which is a thing that all who read the Scripture do know ought to be done in any well-ordered church; and which the antipædobaptists themselves, not regarding the act of toleration, do towards such as are (as they call it) disorderly.

But all this personal blackening, which has run through these two chapters, seems plainly to be only for fear lest those of that persuasion should read what I have written for their use, without prejudice. Which if they will do, I am not unwilling they should read his book after it; and see in which of the two are the signs of that sly malice and hypocrisy which he would affix on me.

---

### CHAP. III.

AS the first two chapters have had very little in them about the cause, but a great deal about me, which concerns not the reader; they being, as he calls them, my ‘character’ (a pretty subject for a book of controversy, and he a fitting person to write men’s characters); so this third concerns neither me nor the cause or matter of my book. What I had written was on the question whether *infants* are to be baptized, or have been in Christ’s church usually baptized. He brings in here three large chapters (or ‘letters’ as he calls them) about another matter, viz. about the *way* of baptizing, whether by dipping or pouring; with which I have meddled as little as possible. I had indeed toward the latter end of my work (where I mention the several tenets of the English antipædobaptists) put in

*obiter* a few words (not two pages in all) of the answers which they that use perfusion do give to the arguments which the others do bring for an absolute necessity of immersion; granting at the same time that that, 'where it may be safely used, is the most fitting manner;' and pleading at another place, as well as I could, for the retrieving of the use of it according to the rubric of the church.

Here he, though he calls his book 'Reflections on mine,' postponing what he had to say about infant-baptism, which was the subject of mine, to nigh the middle of his book, falls into a long discourse about *dipping* in baptism. I make no doubt but that he, or somebody else, had before collected these observations and criticisms in some *adversaria* or commonplace-book. But what makes him call them 'Reflections' on my History? Or what makes him crowd in my name here and there into them? Was that dealing honestly with those of his party, to whom he had, I suppose, promised to write against my book?

Yet all that do content themselves with pouring or sprinkling in baptism have reason to thank him for his long digression about dipping and pouring. Because he has in it said (and according to his way of proving, proved) such things, as being laid together do fully yield up to them the cause for which he contends; as I shall shew presently. He begins,

Page 59, with a sort of syllogism, in which he triumphs, indeed a very transparent paralogism.

The substance of it, this :

'Adult baptism, and that by dipping, is delivered in Scripture *plainly* and *clearly*. Infant-baptism, and by affusion, but *obscurely*, if at all. Therefore *we* do what the Scriptures *expressly* teach; while *they* do, at best, but what is very *obscurely* taught. So *our* case is 'secure, and far the most eligible.'

This argument runs upon a supposition that is not true in fact, viz. as if the pædobaptists did discard or disallow of the baptizing of adult persons, or of dipping in baptism; and did set up affusion in opposition to dipping; and did count an adult person superannuated for baptism. And at this rate Mr. Gale talks in many places, as at p. 156, 'boldly substituting it [infant-baptism] in the 'place of what our Lord did ordain,' [viz. adult baptism.] But the pædobaptists do own and practise the baptizing of adult persons, whenever they meet with any that have not been already baptized; and the dipping of them if they be able to bear it; and do see the examples of this *clearly* and *frequently* delivered in Scripture.

They practise therefore that which he calls 'clear from Scrip-



‘ture.’ But they practise the other too, as being sufficiently shewn from Scripture to be God’s will; though in words not so clear and express. So that his argument runs just as this would do;

Giving the Lord’s supper to *men* is commanded in Scripture *plainly* and *expressly*: giving it to *women* but *obscurely*. Therefore they that should give it only to *men*, and refuse it to *women*, would act most securely.

Whereas the consequence is, they that give it to men are certainly in the right, so far as they go; but yet they would do ill in refusing it to women.

And so, they that give baptism to adult persons not already baptized, and dip them, if they are able to bear it, do well (provided they that give it be persons lawfully called and ordained to the office of baptizing; which I do not see how any among the present antipædobaptists are): but they do ill in refusing it to infants also, and that by affusion, if they are not able to bear dipping.

A servant employed in his master’s business must do his master’s will in all things which he understands to be really meant and intended by him; though some of the things be more plainly expressed than others of them, which he knows by the nature of the thing, and by good consequence from his master’s words, to be his true meaning. Any one sees this author’s argument to be of no force, unless we, who give baptism to infants, did refuse it to adult persons. And indeed arguing is not his talent. He tries at critical learning.

He pretends to wonder at me for offering to give to the word *baptizing* the signification of *washing*; and for saying that it does not necessarily include *dipping* in its signification, but is in Scripture taken for washing in general; such as may be done either by dipping, or pouring, or rubbing water on the thing washed. And he so speaks as if I were singular in, or the first broacher of, this notion of the word; which would be a just reason to like it the less. But all pædobaptists that I know of say the same. It were frivolous to quote many. Chemnitius, *Examen Concilii Trid.* part. ii. can. 3, brings in some papists, in their plea for the *Romish* alterations, arguing that the church has power to alter even the sacraments in the substantial parts; that Christ commanded absolutely to *dip*; and that the word *baptize* does absolutely signify so. He answers, ‘If the word *Βαπτίζω* did signify (*simpliciter*, absolutely, or necessarily) to *dip*, ‘no man might or could have changed the custom. But Paul, an

‘ interpreter most certainly to be depended on, tells us, that to *baptize* is to cleanse by the *washing of water*, Eph. v. Tit. iii. Acts ii., ‘ which is done by any sort of washing.’

Page 61. Mr. Gale undertakes to make it appear plainly, that the word does necessarily include dipping in its signification, and never denotes any thing less. To this purpose he makes a tedious recital of sixty or seventy places; most of them out of the Greek poets that never heard of any sacrament. And at last, to one’s great amazement, there is not one quarter of the places that have the word βαπτίζω, or any derivative of it, in them. Instead of that, they have the word βάπτω, a word never used in Scripture with any relation to baptism, and so nothing to this purpose. Of the rest, which have the word βαπτίζω, it is in some of them used for such washing as is by dipping, or putting the thing spoken of all over into the water; and in some of them not. Which comes up to all that I had said, that the word to *baptize* has, beside the signification *immergo*, that of *lavo* in general.

For his disappointing the reader by bringing citations of βάπτω instead of βαπτίζω, he makes an apology one hundred pages afterwards, [p. 141.] that they are synonymous; and having no proof of it, (as it is impossible he should,) he says that ‘ I do seem to allow them to be so, because I argue promiscuously from both of them.’

I had in my first edition just mentioned, in six or seven lines, two places out of the Old Testament, Dan. iv. 33, and Levit. xiv. 6, in which the Seventy have used βάπτω in the sense (as I then took it) not of dipping, but only of *wetting*. Not taking however βάπτω and βαπτίζω to be synonymous, but meaning thus; that if βάπτω itself did sometimes signify only *wetting*, or a *partial washing*, much more might βαπτίζω (which is but a diminutive of it) be so used. But I was quickly informed of my mistake in the sense of the latter of those texts; and in my second edition left them both out; and in a paper which I published for the use of those that had bought the first edition, owned my reason for so doing. And all this several years before Mr. Gale published his; and there can be little doubt but he had seen it. Men that are any thing versed in the ingenuous way of writing controversies will judge how poor a thing it is in him to spend several pages (as he does in the next chapter, p. 89) in an operose proof of a thing which I had, so long before he or any adversary appeared, owned in a few lines. That these two words are synonymous, he must have some better proof; for I never took them to be so, nor ever heard of any one that did. His friend,

whom he there persuades ‘to take no exception at his using them so,’ had need to be a very good-natured man.

It is needless to spend time in making such exceptions as might be made to the particular quotations that compose the rest of this chapter. I shall only make these three observations about them in general.

1. First, that he being stiff in maintaining that βαπτίζω does always necessarily contain in its signification *dipping*; and being oftentimes troubled how to adapt the notion of *dipping* to some even of these passages here produced by himself, is forced to enlarge the sense of that word to as great a latitude as the pædobaptists ordinarily do give to the word *washing*; and does lay down rules by which the pouring of a small quantity of water on the face (or indeed any other part) of the baptized person is justified, as true baptism, and proved by his principles to be *dipping* the person. And so he has (as I said) yielded up the cause (for which he contends in this and the following chapters) to those who administer baptism by pouring. For here in this chapter, at

Page 76, Having cited a relation of Aristotle concerning a certain sea coast, which at low water is not *baptized*, (that is Aristotle’s word,) but when the tide comes in, is under water; and having observed, as an objection against himself, that βαπτίζεσθαι is here used to signify the land’s being under water, by the water’s coming in upon it, and not by its being put into the water, he solves it thus;— ‘ Besides, the word βαπτίζω perhaps does not so necessarily express ‘ the action of putting under water, as in general, a thing’s being in ‘ that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into ‘ the water, or the water comes over it.’ And he speaks much to the same purpose in the next chapter, p. 92, about the dew in which Nebuchadnezzar was (as he would have it called) *dipped*. And though in the case of Aristotle’s use of the word, he puts in here the word *perhaps*, the thing is *certainly true*, if βαπτίζω does always signify *to dip*: for there is nothing surer, than that the shoal-coast was not put every tide into the water, but the water came over it.

Now add to this what he says, p. 89, where to an argument of mine he answers thus; ‘ The most he can infer from it is only that ‘ it does not always necessarily mean *to dip all over*.——And a little after, ‘ We readily grant that there may be such circumstances in some cases, which necessarily and manifestly shew, the ‘ thing spoken of is not said to be dipped all over, but it does not ‘ therefore follow, that the word in that place does not signify *to dip*. And I believe Mr. Wall will allow his pen is *dipped* in the

‘ink, though it is not daubed all over, or *totally immersed*. So that, ‘after all he says, it still remains that the word does signify *to dip*.’ And after some further talk in the next page, p. 90, ‘the utmost, I say, that could be inferred from this passage, is only that the word does not always necessarily imply a *total immersion*, or *dipping* the whole thing spoken of *all over*, which I readily allow.’ (Mark that.) And a little after, ‘Thus, to use the familiar instance I mentioned before, we say, “Dip the pen,” meaning only the nib of it, which we really dip into ink. Though the whole pen is not *dipped all over*, yet the part particularly referred to is. And the pen may be truly said to be *dipped*, according to that known rule; “What is true of any one part, may be said of the whole complexly, though not of every part of the whole separately.”’ (There is a learned maxim of the private academies.)

He maintains the same thing, p. 95, concerning the hyssop that was to be dipped. ‘The word here is βαπτει, and plainly signifies *to dip*, though it was not *dipped all over*,’ &c.

Now to apply this to the question between the antipædobaptists on the one side, and the church of England, or other protestant church, on the other side, about the manner of baptizing.

*Antipæd.* We must not hold communion with you, because you are not truly baptized, in that you do not dip the person whom you pretend to give baptism to. Whereas *baptism* is *dipping*, and to *baptize* signifies *to dip*.

*Churchman.* We dip all such as do own themselves, or are by their parents owned, to have strength to bear it. On others we pour water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and that is *baptizing*, or (if you will have the word) *dipping*. For your own Mr. Gale teaches that a thing or person is *baptized*, or *dipped*, if it be ‘under water; no matter how it comes so, ‘whether it be put into the water, or the water comes over it,’ p. 76, 92.

*Antipæd.* This might be granted, if you did pour on water enough to cover the person’s body. But a man or a child cannot be said to be *baptized*, covered or *dipped*, with a handful of water poured on the face.

*Churchman.* Yes he may. For the same Mr. Gale does *readily allow*, and *readily grant* to us, and does teach you, that the word *baptize* or *dip* ‘does not always necessarily imply a *total immersion*, ‘or *dipping* the whole thing spoken of, *all over*.’ And he exemplifies this by a pen dipped in the ink. If only the nib of it be put in the ink, ‘the pen,’ he says, ‘may be truly said to be *dipped*.’



And gives a general rule for it, 'What is true of any part,' &c., p. 89—91.

*Antipæd.* Well, but still Mr. Gale stands steady to that, that *to baptize is to dip*; and by a vast number of quotations, with his explanations of them, maintains his point for the word *dip*; and says, p. 110, 'If the word does but signify *to dip*, I ask no more. Let it 'relate to the whole body, or a part of it only; either way I gain 'my point.' The like he says, p. 112, 'It is all we ask.'

*Churchman.* True, but he could not apply the word *dip* to his own quotations, without yielding up the thing itself, which you and all men have been used to mean by *dipping*. He has kept the word, but has granted away the thing. If that which he allows be *dipping*, the controversy is at an end.

Indeed these principles of Mr. Gale will serve to justify, not only those that observe the rules of the church of England, and do *pour* water on such as cannot bear putting into it; but even the most disorderly baptizers of all, whom I confess I know not how to justify by any other. Those, I mean, who, affecting to use as little water as possible, do purposely throw no more than a sprinkle or drop of water on the face of a child. The Scripture will never justify these, nor the ancient church, nor the rubric of the church of England, (for that requires *pouring* in the weakest child's case,) nothing but either the Directory, or Mr. Gale's criticisms. For even by a sprinkle or drop some part is under water, and then the whole man is under water by his 'known rule,' 'what is true of any one 'part,' &c. And if the tip of a finger or a nib of a pen be dipped, the man or the pen is dipped.

Whereas a truer notion is, that βαπτίζω may be used wherever the English word *wash* may be used; but a person can hardly be said to be *washed* by a sprinkle or drop, or by dipping a tip of a finger; or a pen by its nib dipped.

2. Secondly, I cannot but observe the preposterous way which the antipædobaptists take in filling several pages with quotations out of secular authors, where the word βαπτίζω is taken for such washing as is by dipping the thing washed into water (which is the only aim of this long chapter, and part of the following). There are none of the pædobaptists but what do grant and own at the first word, that it is often used in that sense. And I think most of us do own that it is oftener found used so than in any other sense of washing; that way of washing being used in the case of most things that happened to be spoke of. Now when a debate stands so, that both sides do agree, that in secular books a word is

often used for *washing by dipping* ; and there is no question made of that : but the only question between them is this, that one side affirms (but the other denies) that it is sometimes used for *other ways* of washing, as *pouring* or *rubbing water*, &c., (to lump the matter by guess ; say, three thousand times it be found used for this way, and one thousand times for the other ways ;) what an idle thing it is for these deniers to bring instances of that which is confessed by both sides, instead of overthrowing or confuting the instances brought by the others for those other ways.

Thus they do in the case of the word μαθητεύω, *to disciple*, or *make*, or *enter disciples*. No mortal denies, but that word comes in use *oftener* in the case of such disciples as are actually taught, or do begin to learn, at the very time of their entering, or first being called, or made disciples. The only question is, whether that word may not properly be used, or be not sometimes used, for such entering, or calling persons into discipleship as is in order to their being taught hereafter. And yet Mr. Gale in the following chapters spends fifty pages in giving instances where it includes *present* teaching ; which any one would have granted him. And so here he has brought about fourteen instances of the word βαπτίζω, (beside near half a hundred of another word nothing to the purpose,) in most of which (but not all) it is used for such washing as must have been performed by *dipping*. None ever denied that it is often so used ; nor would I deny to any disputant that it is, *for the most part* so used. His task had been to shew that it is never used for washing in those other senses. Not that I would put it upon him to prove a negative absolutely. But he should have confuted or answered those instances to which I there referred the reader, viz. in Mr. Walker's 'Doctrine of Baptism.' He, at p. 84, recites my words, where I say, 'Mr. Walker has largely shewn from the Greek authors, and 'lexicographers, and critics, that besides the signification *immergo*, 'they give it that of *lavo* in general.' And subjoins in his own next words ; 'Whereas you see, sir, I have fully baffled all that is 'alleged from any passages in the Grecian writers.' If he mean this baffling only of the places here alleged by himself, it is a mock fight. But if he mean it of those in Mr. Walker's book, I declare in good earnest, I think this the most shameless saying that ever I read in the book of any man of tolerable repute. I verily believe that he never read (or perhaps never saw) the book : and that any one that reads it will guess the same. And if he have, it is so much the worse.

One thing indeed this chapter is good for. It has helped him to

more authors to fill up his 'Table of Authors,' than perhaps any three other. So many Greek and Latin poets, with their editions, 'London, 1700,' as if they were not common in every schoolboy's hand. And so for *Milton*, *Dryden*, (but *Hudibras* is by some chance missing,) as if they also could teach us any thing about baptism or religion.

3. Thirdly, there is one thing in this chapter which I cannot observe without some disdain. The whole rhapsody of quotations in it is nothing to me, nor to my book. It must probably have been some collection made before. And to make it look as somewhat relating to me, he has in many places of it crowded in my name. But he has in most of them engaged me in such boyish disputes, that I am ashamed to have my name seen in them. To give an instance. At p. 73, he recites out of Aristophanes in his play called, 'The Parliament of Women,' a talk about *washing* of wool, *βάπτουσι*: where first he makes the argument run on my side, and says, 'No doubt if Mr. Wall knows of this place, he thinks it mightily for his posture; and especially if he has but found,' &c., and so goes on for half a page. 'This will please Mr. Wall.' 'He will insist upon this.' But when he has at last learned out of Homer, Suidas, Phavorinus, and two or three more, (what any old woman could have told him,) that wool is commonly put into the water to be washed; then he triumphs over me again, and says, 'This can be of no service to Mr. Wall, unless to convince him,' &c. Whereas the whole criticism, and indeed the whole chapter, do convince me of nothing but of this, that the author of it has mispent a great deal of time; the whole being of no other use than to shew, that the word does sometimes signify such washing as is by *dipping*; which nobody ever doubted of.

4. Fourthly, I will make one observation, a better natured one; tending to the commendation of him and of the antipædobaptists: of them, for their generosity, and being easily pleased; and of him, for his abundant justice. It is to be noted, that this chapter was published a good while before the rest, as a specimen of what the book should be. They seemed very well pleased, and much taken with it, and encouraged him to go forward. Which was an instance of very good nature; since it is so little to the purpose, that if one were to expose him among judicious men, one would desire them to read this chapter. But he is to be commended for doing them more than justice, and making the goods delivered to be delivered better than the sample. For the following chapters are really something more to the purpose, and of a better strain. Always except

the sixth and ninth. In one of which he brings against some passages in my book an accusation so palpably false, that every reader must cry shame on him. In the other he brings (not trifling arguments out of poets and plays, but) the most loathsome and execrable blasphemies out of some Jewish libels, without any relation to the question, without any occasion given, without any advantage to his argument, without any cause that can compensate for the mischief of publishing such scandals, except a pride which he may have in giving his admirers to understand that he is master of that sort of reading.

---

#### CHAP. IV.

WHAT I have already said of the signification of the word βαπτίζω makes it needless to say any thing to what he produces here from two lexicons, and from Vossius, Casaubon, Grotius, Petavius, and Stennet. He would prove from them that its *proper and genuine* sense is *immergo*. At p. 92 he styles it, the *primary and general* sense. If he mean by these epithets only that it is the most *usual and ordinary* sense in which it is taken, I grant it; and his authors prove no more. Constantine, he says, ‘almost always renders it so.’ It is but *almost*. Stephens never fails, &c., ‘till in another period,’ &c. The rest, who are pædobaptists, confess no more than that it is the most usual sense; and Mr. Stennet has done what he himself has here done, given several instances where it is taken so, without pretending to overthrow the instances produced by Mr. Walker and others, where it is used for *washing* only some part of the body or thing spoken of.

In short, it is to no purpose for them to say any more of this matter, till they have answered to those instances in Mr. Walker’s ‘Doctrine of Baptism.’ If they expect that we should write them over again in answer to every new book of theirs, it is an unreasonable demand: since there they stand ready for any one’s examination; and I referred them to them. And it is alike unreasonable to expect, that without their overthrowing the evidence of those there brought, we should spend time in looking out others; and read books to so poor a purpose as is the search of a word.

However, because Mr. Gale is so positive, and ventures his reputation on it, saying here, p. 88, (and to the same purpose at several other places over and over,) ‘that the word is never used to



‘signify *pouring*, but always *dipping* ;’ I will endeavour to prick this bladder of confidence, and name him a place that shall affect the reputation, not only of his skill, but of his veracity; and omitting those in Mr. Walker, (which would be too voluminous,) and any other which I cannot be sure he has seen, mention one which he must have seen (for he quotes a part of the sentence in which it is, in his tenth letter or chapter, p. 242). I do in my answer to that chapter and page recite it at large, (as perhaps he would have done, if it had not been for the shame to have it compared with what he says here, for the word is used by Origen for the action of *baptizing* the sacrifice and wood, which incontestably was only *pouring* water on them :) the reader may stay till he comes to the place, or turn to it beforehand.

Page 88. He is angry that I passed over this matter in so few words, (whereas he has spent more pages on it than I did lines,) and thinks it a sign that I am under some apprehensions that I am not in the right. And I on the contrary think a man’s using a great many words, especially when he says nothing new in them, a sign of such apprehension. To any other man my reason of saying so little of the manner of baptizing should be, because it was none of my subject. To Mr. Gale, how does he know but that I had some intimation that he had lying by him a long collection about that dispute, which (if I meddled with it) he would publish as ‘Reflections’ on me, and make the antipædobaptists believe it was written in answer to me, and expect that I should reply to it. To avoid that trouble, I said as little as possible on that matter, so little as would have prevented the occasion with any other man; but he was resolved to publish his lucubrations, and absurdly put my name in the frontispiece of them. He comes at last,

Page 89, to the use of the word in Scripture (which I had said was chiefly to be regarded); he mentions twenty-five instances which he will give out of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, and at last there are but four (two of the Septuagint, and two in the Apocrypha) that have the word in them. All the rest are of βάπτω. Of these two of the Septuagint, one, Isa. xxi. 4, is a figurative expression, and so nothing to the purpose. He thinks (and truly enough) that ‘nobody will urge that place against him.’ So there is but one, 2 Kings v., Naaman’s washing himself in Jordan; which washing is expressed there four times; once in the command, once in Naaman’s refusal, once in his servant’s entreaty, and once in his actual obeying. In the first three it is λούω, in the last βαπτίζω: a sign that those words are used synonymously and promiscu-

ously. And Naaman's body does not seem to have been leprous all over, (that we need suppose him to have gone all over into the water,) but some one place of it. For what he had expected of the prophet was, that he should have *stricken his hand over the place, and recovered the leper*, ver. 11.

Of the two in the Apocrypha, one is Judith's being washed (or as the word in the Greek is, *baptized*) in or at a spring, to make herself more acceptable to Holophernes, chap. xiii. 7; which whether it were by *dipping* herself, (note, that it was in the camp; for so are the words, '*ad fontem illum aquæ in castris*;' and it appears, from chap. 7, that the springs were especially guarded with soldiers,) or only *washing* her hands, feet, &c., we cannot know.

The other is a place of which Mr. Gale tells a lamentable story how it affrighted him for a while. It relates to the washing that was to be used by one that was unclean by touching a dead body. Syracides, Ecclus. xxiv. 26, ὁ βαπτίζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ, &c. 'He that is washed from (or, after the touching of) a dead body, and toucheth it again, what availeth his washing?' Mr. Gale having observed from Numb. xix. 18, and other places, that such a person was to have the water of purification *sprinkled* on him on the third day and on the seventh day, had thought that the word βαπτίζόμενος related to that *sprinkling*; and says, 'he remembers the time when he thought this a very formidable instance.' He recovered some degree of hope when he observed that the unclean person was (as he thinks) required, beside the sprinkling, to have another washing. He goes a great way about to prove this, partly from Scripture, partly from the customs of the Mahometans and of the Babylonians; and expresses a profane doubt, (whether the Jews borrowed it from the Babylonians, or they from the Jews,) and makes an imperfect proof of it at the last. If there were any such other washing, there is no doubt but the word βαπτίζόμενος refers to both.

But why did the appearance that the word might signify *sprinkling with water* look so formidable to Mr. Gale? All the tendency that it had, was to have convinced him that he must acknowledge his Christian neighbours, who had received this sacrament by sprinkling or perfusion, to be baptized persons as well as himself; and so the separation between them must not have continued. All the separators who are of a sincere and charitable principle do own it to be a desirable thing, that all Christians were of one body and communion; and that if they could be satisfied in conscience that it were lawful for them to join with the church, they

should count it a great happiness so to do. But any appearance of such satisfaction or conviction is to Mr. Gale, it seems, a ‘very formidable’ thing. Such expressions, starting from a man before he is aware, do give the truest indications of his inward aims and fears. I had mentioned, at the latter end of my book, a sort of people who ‘keep their consciences (as beggars do their sores) raw and unhealed ‘on purpose.’ The readers of this expression of his will be apt to make the application.

These four are all the instances where the word βαπτίζω is used by the Septuagint, or the Greek writers or translators of the apocryphal books. They used other words instead of it. For washing of clothes, πλύνω; of the body, or hands, or any part, λούω; (as almost always where it is ordered, *He shall wash his flesh, or wash or bathe all his flesh in water*, they render it, λούσεται ὕδατι, or λούσεται τὸ σῶμα, or πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι;) where a foot, or hand, or finger, or tip of a finger, or top of a bunch of hyssop, is dipped in water, they use mostly βάπτω. On that one instance which I brought (in my first edition, but left it out in the second) of Nebuchadnezzar’s body being *wet* with dew, (which they render ἐβάφη,) Mr. Gale makes a long discourse, and would have it to be, *was dipped* in dew; and runs to St. Helena, the Leeward Islands, Egypt, &c., to fetch in stories of dew, all to no purpose; since the words are ἀπὸ τῆς ὁρότου, from, or by the dew. No writer whatsoever would speak of a body *dipped from the dew*, or *by* or *with the dew*.

Of the four instances which I (passing by others) had in half a page produced out of the New Testament, to prove that *to baptize* is a word oftentimes there so used as not to include *dipping* in its signification, the first was Luke xi. 38, where St. Luke says, *The Pharisee marvelled that our Saviour was not first baptized, οὐ πρότερον ἐβαπτίσθη, before dinner*. Now all that the Pharisee expected, was that he should have washed his hands before dinner. I shewed this to be all that they themselves did, or required of others, from Mark viii. 5, and Mr. Gale makes it no otherwise.

I called this a plain instance, that St. Luke uses the phrase of a man’s being *baptized*, in a case there there is no *dipping* of him, but only washing his hands. And I do still think it so plain an one, that nothing of good sense can be objected against it. And I am the more confirmed by the impertinence of all that Mr. Gale brings in answer to it; which answer of his is at

Page 99, &c. I entreat the reader to mind well.

He says thus; ‘If the Jews washed their hands, as we usually do

‘ now, by dipping them into the water, this instance turns against ‘ him, and makes considerably for us.’ And then he labours for ten pages to prove that they did so.

If St. Luke had said that the Pharisee’s wonder was, that our Saviour did not *baptize his hands* before dinner, this answer had been sense; (though I think not true;) but is the washing of a *man’s hands* by dipping them the dipping of *the ‘man’*? When any one in washing his hands puts them into the water, is *that man* then *dipped*? Or had it been proper for St. Luke to say that the Pharisee marvelled that our Saviour had not first been *dipped* before dinner, when he meant only washing his hands? But he does actually say, he marvelled that he *was not baptized*. A plain instance that St. Luke took the word *baptized* for a more general word than *dipped*. The English translators express it *washed*; but St. Luke’s own words are as I have set them down.

I know Mr. Gale will stand to this, that when a man’s hands or feet are dipped, the man is dipped, (for he does stand to it at p. 89, 90, 94, as was before observed,) and I had rather he should. For then, as I there shewed, he gives up all the cause at once. If that which the Scripture requires to be done in baptism be, that *the person* be *dipped*; and if he who has any part of his body *dipped*, (or which Mr. Gale, p. 76, 92, owns to be all one, *covered with water*;) be dipped; then we do all of us *dip* in baptism, (nay we are ourselves hemerobaptists,) and there is no reason for the separation on that account.

If St. Luke by *ἐβαπτίσθη* meant the washing of hands by putting them in the water, the argument will be as I here urge it. But if he meant, and if the Jews before meals commonly used washing them by *pouring water* on them, then there will be still less to be said against this instance. And that this latter was their custom, I brought a plain proof for the times before our Saviour out of the Old Testament; and for the times after him, from the Jewish rabbins, Maimonides, &c., and from Dr. Pococke arguing out of them.

To the proof of the Old Testament, 2 Kings iii. 11, where it is used as an ordinary periphrasis of Elisha’s having been a servant or disciple of Elijah, that he *poured water on the hands of Elijah*, he answers,

‘ That this was long before our Saviour’s time; and great alterations might happen in the mean time: and here he talks of the revolutions of states and kingdoms, and how the Jews had been conquered by the Babylonians and Romans; and you must think



that they imposed new laws upon them for the ways of washing their hands. He proves also from the Old Testament and the New, that they were an obstinate, bigoted, stiffnecked race. From whence the reader must conclude, that they would not wash their hands as they should do. If this man were to write a large book, he would never want matter.

He would alter the translation, and have it to be ‘who poured out ‘water for the hands,’ but the Septuagint render it ἐπὶ χεῖρας: and so does the Latin, *super*. And so, I doubt not, do all the translations in the world. So that the common sense of mankind, concerning the meaning of a phrase in Scripture, must be altered to serve the purpose of a separation.

He talks here of the brasen sea, and counts how many barrels of water it held; and of the laver in the court of the tabernacle; and how the priests were to wash their hands and feet thereat; but he would have it said *therein*, contrary to the text, and all translations, (which render it ἐξ αὐτοῦ and *ex eo*;) but whethersoever it was, what is that to the people’s ordinary washing before meals?

Our Saviour, he observes, poured water into a bason, and washed the disciples’ feet. Here he tells you what is Greek for a bason, and for the water; but cannot tell us whether our Saviour put their feet into the bason or not. Nor is it material that he should; for our question is of washing *hands*. And that feet also were generally washed by water poured on them, appears probable by our Saviour’s way of expressing it, Luc. vii. 44, ὕδωρ ἐπὶ πόδας μου, which properly signifies *upon my feet*.

Our Saviour, he says, [p. 101,] poured water into a bason. ‘We ‘see the water was not poured on their feet, but into the bason.’ But does not he know that νιπτήρ commonly signifies those little vessels in fashion of small cisterns, which had a cock to let out or pour water on the hands or feet? And he himself cites here Eustathius<sup>g</sup>, where he says that χέρνιβα are vessels that pour out water on

<sup>g</sup> [The passage referred to is on the Odyssey, book I. 136.

Χέρνιβα δ’ ἀμφίπολος προχόω ἐπέχευε φέρουσα,

Where the comment of Eustathius is, χέρνιβα τὸ κατὰ χειρὸς διδόμενον ὕδωρ. τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ τινες ὕδωρ καὶ χειρόνιπτρον φασιν. Thus Pollux likewise interprets both νιπτήρ and ποδόνιπτρον by the *water*, and Eustathius himself attributes the like sense to ἀπόνιπτρον. He then quotes Athenæus as defining πρόχοος to be ἀγγεῖον ἐν ᾧ τὸ ὕδωρ χέρνιβα δὲ τὰ εἰς χειρὸς νίμμα καταχέμενα.

There appears to be some uncertainty

and indistinctness of signification between two cognate words here: the vessel, which held τὰ χέρνιβα, being sometimes expressed by χέρνιψ, χερνίβιον, and sometimes by χέρνιβον. (See the Lexicographers.)

Bishop Maltby, in his edition of Morell’s Thesaurus, gives χέρνιψ as signifying the *water*, and χέρνιβον the *vessel*, referring for proof to Homer, Iliad. Ω. 302.

After all, the argument in the text is not affected by the dispute; for the word χέρνιβα does not occur in the passage of St. John referred to.]

the hands: though Mr. Gale (by a mistake, which one would think such a man incapable of) translates his words quite contrary, and takes χέρνυβα to mean, not the cisterns, but the water.

In the text, Mark vii. 3, *the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not*, he would have the word πνγμῇ to be rendered not *oft*, but *up to the wrist*, (and that indeed is what many learned men of late have thought to be the meaning of the word,) or *up to the elbow*, (for which he quotes some few;) this he concludes ‘must imply dipping.’ It was but to say so positively, and in short; for proof or reason for such conclusion there is none; since every body knows he can with water *poured* or running from a cock wash his hands up to the wrist without dipping them.

I had said at that place that Dr. Pococke had largely proved out of Maimonides and other rabbins, that this washing of hands before meals, used by the Jews, was by water running or *poured* out of a vessel or little cistern, or *poured* by some servant for that purpose. It was ill-fortune that I mentioned this. For it has brought upon Maimonides, and the rabbins, and Dr. Pococke too, a great deal of anger from our author, who thinks himself no mean judge. Dr. Pococke, he says, was a learned gentleman, &c. ‘But really, sir, I should have honoured his parts and learning much more, if he had trusted less to those fanciful authors the rabbins,’ &c. It is pity the doctor could not foresee this; for surely he would have altered the course of his studies. ‘Maimonides,’ he says, ‘was one of the greatest and most judicious that ever appeared among the rabbins; but a true rabbi notwithstanding, and perfectly besotted,’ &c. As for the other rabbins, he will ‘say more of them in another place.’ Now allowing that these rabbins are fanciful and absurd reasoners, (which is indeed their character with men of another size of judgment than our author, and with all men,) and that one would not depend upon them for any matter of moment; yet can he think that they are not capable of telling what is their own custom in washing their hands? That explication of πνγμῇ in St. Mark, (to signify *up to the perék, or wrist*,) was never thought of by learned men till they learned from the rabbins that custom of washing their hands in some cases. For the word has naturally no such import. Shall we in our explications of a word in Scripture borrow the notion from a custom of theirs, and yet not believe that they had such a custom? Or shall we believe them when they say they washed to the wrist, and yet think that they themselves cannot tell how they do it; by dipping the hand, or pouring water on it?

He makes a greater matter of the difference between βαπτίζεσθαι

and *χερνίπτειν*, and cannot see that in this very place, Mark vii. 23, as also in the parallel place, Matt. xv. 2, and 20, (which speak of the washing before meals,) the word is *χερνίπτειν*. For it is *χερσὶν ἀνίπτουσιν*, and *νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας*, where they speak of the same washing before meals which St. Luke describes by *ἐβαπτίσθη*. And Dr. Pococke both says himself, and quotes Beza saying the same, that *βαπτίζεσθαι* here in St. Luke means the same as *λούεσθαι* and *χερνίπτειν*, *to wash*, or *to wash the hands*. And that, ‘since that washing of the hands might be done, either by putting them in the water, or by pouring water on them; there is (here in the text of St. Luke) a word used, *ἐβαπτίσθη*, which comprehends both the one and the other of those ways.’

He says at last,

Page 103, That I have abused Dr. Pococke in my quotation of his words; yet he does not deny the words which I cited to be as I cited them; nor that he does in a great part of that long chapter shew at large from the rabbins, that this *pouring* of water was the Jews’ ordinary way of washing their hands: but only, that he observes (as he does indeed) that a Jew might, if he pleased, instead of *pouring on* water, put his hands into the water; and that it is likely enough that some of them did: and that the word *βαπτίζεσθαι* does comprehend both of these ways. ‘For,’ says the doctor, ‘though *βαπτίζεσθαι* does indeed especially (*præcipue*) suit to that washing which is by immersion; yet that it does not necessarily mean that, nor is used only for that, I think is plain from that which we read in Luke xi. 38. ‘The Pharisee marvelled that οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη<sup>h</sup>.’

This quotation, which he brings to confront that which I brought, is one that I might have well added to mine. For it shews the doctor’s sense most plainly, both concerning the matter in general, (that *to baptize* does not necessarily signify *to dip*,) and also its acceptance in this particular text.

But of these last words of his, wherein he appeals to this text, Mr. Gale says, [p. 104,] ‘It is a downright begging of the question, ‘to instance in the very case disputed:’ (oh, the man’s logic!) as if Dr. Pococke had wrote that book in a dispute between himself and Mr. Gale, (who was not then born,) about the meaning of that word in that text. Whereas he brings it in as a plain text, to explain another, on which he had been discoursing.

Mr. Gale has the courage thus to conclude this debate concerning Dr. Pococke’s opinion, at

<sup>h</sup> [Not. Miscel. c. 9. p. 397.]

Page 104. ‘It may be fairly gathered from the doctor’s words, ‘that in Luke xi. 38, and Mark vii. 4, βαπτίζεσθαι does naturally and ‘*principally* signify to wash the hands by dipping, which is all I ‘desire,’ &c. Now whoever shall read the doctor’s words, (even as they stand in Mr. Gale’s quotation, much more in those which I produced, and much more in the place itself,) and shall not perceive the doctor to say that βαπτίζεσθαι, though it is for the most part used for such washing as is by *dipping*, yet it is not *always* so used, and particularly not in this text of Luke xi. 38, I would advise him to go to some private academy.

And I should be sorry to have any reader, to whom it may not be safely left to judge whether any or all of these exceptions of Mr. Gale against this text do take off the force of the proof, that St. Luke, speaking of a man as *baptized* when only his *hands are washed*, does use the word in such a sense as does not include in its signification the *dipping* of the person spoken of.

It was however necessary that this paragraph (on which Mr. Gale owns he has been very long) should end as the rest do, with a triumph, (as here, ‘in fine, what the doctor says from the rabbins, ‘&c., makes nothing for Mr. Wall, but rather against him,’) or else how should his ignorant readers applaud, and say, ‘That’s brave for ‘our side!’

The next instance of a proof that baptism in Scripture is used for other washings beside dipping, taken from Mark vii. 4, (which I had just mentioned in two lines, but several learned men have largely insisted on,) he, after his arrogant manner, treats with great contempt, and, at

Page 105, wonders what I mean by producing it.

St. Mark is there reciting how the Pharisees and all the Jews do (among other traditions which, he says, *they received to hold*) hold the *baptism of cups, and pots, brasen vessels, and tables*; which our English do rightly translate, the *washing* of cups, &c., but St. Mark’s word is *baptisms* of them. Now some of these things may be conceived to be put into the water when washed, but some of them cannot. And yet St. Mark calls both one way of washing and the other, the *baptism* of them. And so he recites our Saviour’s own expression of the same thing, ver. 8.

What the rest of them do oppose to this proof, I know not. Mr. Gale opposes nothing material, but (what he opposes to every proof) confidence, and some insulting expressions. He cites a place of Scripture nothing relating to this case, but to what the Jews were to do by the command of God, Levit. xi. 32, whereas St. Mark



and our Saviour at this place are speaking of what they did (over and beside the command of God) by their own superstition, and from the tradition of their elders: *Teaching* (as our Saviour expresses it, at ver. 7, 8,) *for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the baptisms of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do.* What God commanded at the place cited by Mr. Gale, Levit. xi. 32, was only in case of any vessel that happened to be under any legal defilement by the carcass of a mouse, or any other unclean creature falling in it. And that, if it were of wood, raiment, skin, or sack, was to be put into the water; if it were earthen, to be broken; if it were of brass, or any other metal that would abide the fire, they were (as is ordered, Numb. xxxi. 23,) to make it go through the fire, and sprinkle on it the water of separation. So that brasen or silver vessels, pots or cups, were not commanded in the law to be put into water at all. And consequently Mr. Gale argues against himself, if he apply this legal purification of them (which had no other use of water but sprinkling) to that which St. Mark calls the baptizing of them.

But besides, this is not the case our Saviour speaks of. Does Mr. Gale think that he would have blamed the Pharisees or Scribes for doing any thing of this, which in such a case of uncleanness was commanded by God? The washings or baptisms here spoken of were such as had been devised by the Jews themselves, to be used without the case of legal uncleanness, as often (as it seems by the context) as those pots, vessels, or tables were used at any meal. At which times they were much more careful to have the outside of the cups clean than they were of the inside; as our Saviour told the Pharisee, at whose dinner he sat, and who marvelled at his omission of baptism or washing. So different are the cases that are spoken of in Leviticus from that here spoken of by St. Mark. And yet Mr. Gale, applying them to this, urges that he ‘has the express word of God for it.’

He quotes here, p. 106, a few words in my book, just at the same rate, and with the same misapplication that he does the Scripture. He says of me, ‘He allows that the Jews did immerse the thing or person to be washed.’ There are indeed those words at the place he quotes, expressing in short what was more fully spoken of in my Introduction, § 7. Whoever reads those places will see, that the case there spoken of is that of any ‘person or thing which was by the Jews’ law to have a tevillah, or solemn washing, their custom ‘was to do it three times over.’ What is that case of a vessel

which by God's law was to be put into the water, to this superstitious washing of vessels or tables before meals?

There is not a more palpable proof of the insincerity of any writer, than when he quotes some words of Scripture or of any author to one sense, which, if one turn to the place, do there plainly appear to be meant in another sense. As for my words, it is no great matter; but God's word is not to be so used, nor ever is, unless by men that write for a side, or for some wicked purpose.

I mentioned another instance in the same text of St. Mark, where he says, of *the Pharisees and all the Jews, When they come from market, except they be baptized, they eat not.* Where common sense teaches us to understand it, (as our translators do express it,) *except they wash, they eat not.* For it is inconceivable, and an impracticable thing for men that live near a market, and have frequent occasions to go in and out, especially servants and officers of the market, who must go into it several times in a day, to undress and dip themselves as often as they eat.

So that St. Mark, speaking of this baptizing as used by all the Jews, does plainly use the word for such washing as is without dipping. And the Jews themselves, who used these washings, do not pretend that they used in this case any other but such washings as are without dipping; for which I quoted Dr. Pococke. Most of Mr. Gale's readers indeed do not know who he was, nor how unexceptionable an evidence his verdict is, concerning any practice of the Jews; but learned men do know it; and Mr. Gale himself, a few pages before, viz. p. 102, had confessed, that 'he has taken a world of labour, &c., and has shewn himself very well versed in the rabbinical writings, which he understood, perhaps, as well as Maimonides did.' And yet now mind Mr. Gale's answer here to all this.

Page 106, &c. He owns that Dr. Pococke is positive in this, that they who washed coming from market did not dip themselves all over; and that 'he calls the whole body of rabbins to his assistance,' &c.; but answers, 'That all this is but light and inconsiderable evidence, to build all on the authority of a thousand rabbins,' &c., and so he goes on to talk of 'the silly whimsies of these men,' and the insufficiency of their evidence.

If the question were about what we *ought* to believe or do, or what the Jews themselves *ought* to have believed or done, or what washings they *ought* to have observed; and any body had quoted the rabbins, or set any value on their judgment for that; this answer, shewing the shallowness of their judgment, had been pertinent.

But the matter then before the doctor, and now before us, is not what the Jews *ought* to have held or practised, but what they *did* practise. It is the 'silly whimsies' of these men, that our Saviour and St. Mark in this text are speaking of, and which Dr. Pococke in that chapter does explain. If in a question of what *ought* to be held or practised, one should lay any stress on the opinions of the *Quakers* or *Muggletonians*, the argument will be weak enough; but in a question of what they *do* hold, the proof must be taken from themselves and from their writings. And in this case to answer by saying, 'They are an injudicious sort of people,' would be so trifling and impertinent an answer, that I question whether any rabbi or quaker ever made a weaker.

Though I am weary, and would be short, yet I must spend two or three lines in entreating the reader to mind the absurdity and inconsequence of this way of arguing or answering. [The rabbins are a fabulous and whimsical sort of men; therefore they cannot tell us what whimsies they themselves do hold.] Because Mr. Gale, in some places before this, and in some after it, spends a great deal of time in shewing the vanity of the Jewish writers; where his argument must run to that effect, or else (as the reader will observe) it signifies nothing to the matter he is answering.

We do all grant the Pharisees, rabbins, and generality of the Jews to have been a superstitious and vain people. St. Mark says, that among other superstitions, they *baptized* upon coming from market to meals. If they, as superstitious and whimsical as they were, did not dip themselves in that case, then it plainly follows, that St. Mark does use the word in the case of such washing as is not dipping; and the enlarging on their folly does not avoid the force of the argument.

But Mr. Gale produces two writers, who, in their comments on the place, do say that the Jews did in such cases dip their whole body. As there is nothing in natural philosophy so absurd, but that some philosopher has said it; so I think there is hardly any interpretation of Scripture so improbable, but that one may find here and there some one or two commentators that have given it. The magazine of Pole's Synopsis has furnished him with two for his purpose.

The first is Vatablus. Mr. Gale says, p. 106, 'Against them [the rabbins, and those that build on their authority] and the doctor I produce Vatablus, a man so singularly versed in the rabbinical writings,' &c. An apt qualification! Did his skill in the writings of the rabbins (which was just now good for nothing) qua-

lily him to give an interpretation concerning their practice contrary to what they themselves do all give? But the truth is, that Vatablus never wrote any comments at all, on this or any other part of Scripture; only as he read his lectures, some hearers took notes of what he said, and afterwards published them. In which case what mistakes and blunders do happen, every one knows.

The next is, Grotius *in loc.*, concerning whom I had largely shewn by several instances, part i. chap. 8. § 7, and chap. 11. §. 9, and part. ii. chap. 11. §. 9, what a partiality he everywhere discovers for the antipædobaptists, even to the manifest altering the sense of the authors which he cites. It is the less wonder, if in his ordinary expositions he wrested the sense of one text to their side.

But what is chiefly to be regarded in any such case of interpreters, differing in their opinions or expositions of any particular point, is, to mind which of them appears to have studied that particular matter most. Though Grotius was a man of universal learning, yet he, speaking his sense in a transient way, in the ordinary course of his expositions, in few words, and without any proof given, is not to be depended upon for any particular thing; so much as one that has applied himself to the study of that particular. Which Dr. Pococke is known to have done, and to have written largely and accurately on that subject of the customs of the Jews, and particularly their washings, proving every thing by many testimonies; yet after all, Mr. Gale concludes as he uses to do, ‘These authorities are vastly beyond Mr. Wall’s quotation.’

But he will prove by other ways, viz. from antiquity and from the sacred text, that the Jews coming from market dipped themselves before they eat. His readers must blush for him, to see how he does it.

Upon the place of Scripture which he produces he puts a broad and palpable abuse; and to call it the ‘sacred text’ while he is doing so, renders the abuse the more profane; he says, ‘The priests were forbid to eat, unless they first washed their flesh in water.’ [p. 107.]

That, if it were true, is nothing to the market; and if the priests had done so, that is nothing to the people. It is *all the Jews* (i. e. at least, the generality of the people) of whom St. Mark speaks. And he speaks not of any command of Scripture which they kept, but a custom of their own. But mind the text to which he refers, (for he dared not set down the words,) Levit. xxii. 6, where all that is commanded is, that the priests, when they had touched any



creeping thing, or any man, or thing, that was unclean by the dead, should not eat of the holy things till they had washed their flesh in water. Now what is all this to the people, who had not touched any creeping thing, &c., eating, not *holy* but ordinary food when they came from market?

The antiquity that he brings is nothing but this: that there was a sect of men among the Jews who bathed themselves every day, called therefore *hemerobaptists*: which has no connection with the thing we are talking of, but only in Pole's Synopsis it follows next after the forecited quotations out of Vatablus and Grotius; and Mr. Gale, though he was come to the end of all that was pertinent there, yet would still write on. He values himself and his readers so little, as to spend time in quoting four or five authors for this, (which I think are all quoted by Pole too,) which is a commonly known thing. And it may be collected from the author's ascribing this practice as peculiar to this sect, that the generality of the Jews did not do so. He quotes indeed Tertullian, as saying, 'Though the Jews daily wash every part of the body, yet they are never clean.' But he names not the place. And if Tertullian do any where say so, it must be accounted only an over-lashing expression; saying of the Jews in general what was true only of some one sect of them.

Page 108. He argues yet further from the order of St. Mark's words. He had said in the words next before, *the Jews, except they wash their hands* [oft, as the English, and, I think, all translations read it; or, *up to the wrist*, as some learned men of late expound it,] *eat not*, &c. and then adds, *and when they come from market, except they be baptized*, &c. Now Mr. Gale thinks that St. Mark, after he had said, verse 3, *They eat not, except they wash their hands up to the wrist*, would not have presently added, *And when they come from market they eat not, except they be baptized*, if he had not meant something more by this latter washing, which he names *baptizing*, than by the former, of washing their hands.

This observation, I confess, does confirm me in the opinion that the translations are right as they are; and that how true soever the account given by learned men from the rabbins may be, that the Jews in some cases wash *up to the wrist*, yet that St. Mark had not any intention here of expressing that by the word  $\pi\upsilon\gamma\mu\eta$ , (which has not naturally any such signification,) but that he meant by it, *often, diligently, thoroughly*, or the like, as almost all men till of late have expounded it. And the sense and order of the words is natural: thus the Pharisees and generality of the Jews have a superstitious

opinion, that they must not eat without washing their hands *often* [over and over, or carefully,] and they place religion in this; holding it as a tradition from their elders; and particularly when they come from market, they must wash (or be washed) before they eat.

Mr. Gale here, to prove that they washed their whole body when they came from market, runs as far as to the custom of the Mahometans. And yet even in their customs does not find at last any such thing. They, he says, before they go to prayers, do wash the face, the hands, the feet; and upon greater and extraordinary pollutions, the whole body. And so did the Jews by God's command wash the whole body upon some great pollutions: nor would our Saviour have blamed them for that. But neither Jews nor Mahometans do it upon a return from market to eating; nor does his author pretend that they do.

Page 109. He has yet one shift more, to evade this text; but so wretched an one, as shews how hardly he is driven; viz. that the words of St. Mark should be translated another way, without any relation to washing either body or hands, and be understood thus: 'The things which they buy at market they eat not, except they baptize them;' that is, (as he would have it,) dip them. And then he vaunts after his conceited fashion: 'If this be the sense of the words, they are directly against Mr. Wall,' (thus he brings in my name to all his absurd conceits,) 'for nobody will make a question how herbs are washed.' But will any body make a question whether other things beside herbs were sold at market? He should have altered St. Mark's words more yet, and made him speak of a herb-market. Does he think that wheat, meal, honey, milk, salt, &c., were dipped in water before they were eaten? It is a great abuse of Scripture, to put such absurd interpretations upon it, merely to serve a turn; and because one is resolved not to take the texts in their plain sense. But however, this paragraph must conclude as all the rest do. Whatever there be in the middle of them, they always end well. As the last words of this are, 'Either way I gain my point.' A few such victories will undo a better cause than his is. And the evasion, that he here again repeats and uses whenever he is at a dead lift, (that the Jews coming from market were *dipped*, if their hands only were dipped,) does, as I shewed before, plainly give it up.

I had cited also Heb. ix. 10, where the apostle says, the service of the Jewish tabernacle consisted *only in meats and drinks and divers washings*, &c. *divers baptisms*, *διάφοροι βαπτισμοί*, is the apostle's

word. Now those washings, I said, were some by dipping or bathing, others by sprinkling. And his calling both one sort and the other *baptisms* proves that he used the word for *washing* in general, whether it be by dipping or sprinkling.

Mr. Gale's first answer is, that though there were several sorts of washing used, some by bathing, and some by sprinkling; yet the apostle there meant to express *only the bathings*, and says,

Page III, that it should be translated, 'divers bathings or dippings.'

This sense might possibly be forced upon the place if the apostle's word for *divers* were not such as does necessarily signify *divers sorts* or *kinds* of the thing spoken of. The English language uses the word *divers* wherever one may say *many* or *several*; as *divers* men, *divers* times, &c., meaning *several* men, &c. But the apostle's word here, *διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς*, does, both by its etymology and constant use, signify *divers kinds of baptisms*, or *baptisms of divers sorts*. If his word had been, that the service consisted *ἐν πολλοῖς*, or *ἐν πλείοσι βαπτισμοῖς*, it might have been mistaken, as Mr. Gale here mistakes it, for *divers*, i. e. *many washings in number*. But the word signifies different in *kind*. So that here Mr. Gale's skill in *genus*, and *species*, and *individuum*, (which he seems to value himself much upon, and spills it often on every occasion,) might have done him some service. Many *dippings*, one may say, the service required; but one cannot say, *many sorts of dippings*. Since then the apostle applies to his word *baptisms* an epithet implying several *sorts* of them; it is plain that he uses the word (as we use the word *washings*) for other washings beside dipping. And I, though I wrote but two lines on this text, set down the apostle's word *διαφόροις*, on purpose that it might prevent these two pages of Mr. Gale and this of mine.

A second answer that he gives is in these words,

Page III: 'However, if we grant the sacred writer designed 'by the words all the Jewish purifications by sprinkling as well as by 'dipping:' and a little after: 'Granting for once that sprinklings 'are included in the writer's design; yet the word only signifies 'dipping,' &c.

This you see is an invincible man; and there is no disputing with him. He having said a little before, 'For I still assert, the word 'does always, and here too, only signify *dippings*;' I see the apostle may say what he will. He will grant for once that the apostle 'designs by the words sprinkling as well as dipping;' and yet will stand his ground, and carry his point. And all this, when the dispute

is concerning the sense in which it is taken in Scripture. Therefore let who will answer his next two pages. For there he shews how Cicero in one of his letters (and at the foot of the page he names the very letter, and in the index, the edition) says, ‘charissimæ ani-  
‘mæ;’ whereas the proposition to have been proved was this: that granting that St. Paul designs by the word *baptism* sprinkling as well as dipping; yet the word only signifies dipping.

I had in the first edition referred to Matt. xxvi. 23, *He that dip-  
peth his hand with me in the dish, &c.*, but left it out in the second, because the word there is not βαπτίζω, but ἐμβάπτω, which, though it be rendered and do signify *to dip*, yet not in the sense that the antipædobaptists understand dipping, viz. to immerse the thing spoken of all over. For the whole hand was not dipped.

Now this Mr. Gale grants, and says, ‘The question is not about  
‘the whole, or a part of the subject, but whether the Greek word  
‘signifies only *to dip* ;’ and concludes, ‘if it be true that βαπτίζω  
‘does only signify *to dip*, it is all we ask—and our present dispute  
‘is at an end.’ [p. 112.]

He should have minded that the word he speaks of is not in the text; but another word which is generally by the English rendered *to dip*; whereas βαπτίζω is never in the New Testament so rendered by them.

Yet for the word βαπτίζω itself, if the dispute will end upon its being granted always to signify *to dip*, in Mr. Gale’s sense of the word *dip*, I see nothing to the contrary but it may end presently. He yields his word *dip* to mean the very same thing (neither more nor less than) we mean by our word *wash*, (as I shewed before in my answer to his third chapter.) The same definition will serve both for *washing* and for *dipping* in his sense. It is ‘an application  
‘of water to the subject, or some part of it.’ All that I fear is, that the antipædobaptists will not stand to the determination of this their manager, but will say, he has betrayed and given up their cause. If they do all mean by *dipping*, no more than he has yielded it to be, it is true what he says, ‘the dispute is at an end.’ It is no matter whether we call it *washing* or *dipping*. But then the schism would be at an end too: which would be, as Mr. Gale knows, a formidable thing.

The same answer serves to take off the exceptions which he brings against the next observation that I made, viz. ‘That the  
‘sacramental *washing* is often in Scripture expressed by other  
‘words beside *baptizing*; which other words do signify *washing* in



‘the ordinary and general sense.’ And I cited three or four texts, and might have done more, where *λούω*, *to wash*, and *λουτρὸν*, *the washing*, is used in the case of baptizing. Which I did, as conceiving it probable that the Scripture would not, in the same case of administering this sacrament, use sometimes one of these words and sometimes the other, if they were not of a signification alike as to the main. Mr. Gale’s exception against this at

Page 112, &c. is to this effect; that *λούω*, *to wash*, is the *general* word, and *βαπτίζω*, *to dip*, is one kind or *species* of washing; so that the Scripture may well call baptism, or dipping, a *washing*, for ‘all dipping is washing, though all washing is not dipping.’ And here, having a great deal of time to spare, he runs out, and shews at large his learning in the doctrine of *genus* and *species*, (which they that have lately gone so far, and not much farther, are very apt to do,) quoting the very place of Aristotle, that the *species* contains the *genus*, but not *vice versa*.

But I suppose when he studied that, he learned something of *differentia* too. If *washing* be the *genus*, and dipping a *species* of it, this last must have a *difference*, which together with the *genus* must constitute it. And in the common acceptation of the word *dipping*, it has one; but in Mr. Gale’s notion of dipping, it has none, (as I shewed before) for there is now *ashing*; but will be a *dipping*, as he has enlarged the sense of the word.

And if he had done this without being forced to it, the men of his opinion might have been angry with him. But neither could he nor can any man maintain that in all places of Scripture where *βαπτίζω* is used it signifies *to dip*, without admitting that, or some other such like absurdity.

---

## CHAP. V.

THIS chapter seems to me to have been written, not by Mr. Gale, but by somebody else, (and, I think, I have heard that some *Dutch Minnists* have had a hand in this work, some composing one part, some another; so that he does well to call them letters :) my reasons are,

1. He had, at the end of the last chapter, spoke as one concluding what he had to say on that subject. ‘Thus you see, sir, how little there is in what our author says—I hope I have acted very uprightly in examining all his instances, &c. Besides those he mentions, I have likewise considered all other instances that I

‘could imagine,’ &c. [p. 115.] And yet here this author begins again anew.

Secondly, some of the last words of the last chapter are, ‘such metaphorical passages as Matt. xx. 22, *Are ye able to be baptized*, &c., and such like, are so manifestly figurative and obscure, that they cannot be thought to furnish any argument either way; and therefore I pass them by.’ The writer of this letter not knowing what Mr. Gale had said, not only brings the same saying of our Saviour, but several others less to the purpose than that.

However that be, Mr. Gale the publisher has here and there crowded my name into the dispute, and if this be not his, has owned it, by putting a line speaking of it, to the tail of the foregoing.

It begins with expostulating why I should appeal to Scripture for the sense of a Greek word, and says, ‘The poets and grammarians can give the sense of it as well as the Scripture,’ and wonders that ‘a gentleman of understanding should’ &c.

Now if he be one that does not know that the Scripture does use many words, especially those relating to the sacraments, in a peculiar idiom, and that this is observed and confessed by all readers of Scripture of tolerable learning; I am sorry I cannot return his compliment concerning *understanding*.

He uses arguments why God should not suffer this, which would render the Scriptures obscure, &c. But what signify reasonings against fact? At last he condescends, at

Page 117, to ‘join issue with me here,’ that the use of it in Scripture shall determine the sense of it.

But to what purpose does this trial begin *de novo*, if he knew that Mr. Gale had tried this issue before, and had, according, to his own verdict, ‘gained his point.’

What places of Scripture does he bring at last where βαπτίζω is used? Not one at present. But if you will take up with places where βάπτω is used, he brings three of them. The others, where βαπτίζω is used, shall, he says, ‘be taken notice of by and by.’ [p. 118.] But before he comes to them, he says here, at

Page 118, ‘In the mean time you see, sir,’—‘I have said enough now to satisfy any man in the world—that the word βαπτίζω does always, without exception, signify only *to dip*.’ Then I would, if I were as he, never bring the places at all; for when they come, they are not half so strong as is this conclusion taken beforehand. What he brings in this:

Origen somewhere speaks of men ὑπὸ τῆς κακίας καταβεβαπτισμένων,

‘baptized [or, as this author renders it, *given up*] to wickedness.’

Clemens Alexandrinus, of some, who through drunkenness are βαπτίζόμενοι εἰς ὕπνον, *baptized into sleep*: he renders it, *dipped in sleep*. And at another place, Strom. chap. iii. p. 473; ‘We [Christians] who formerly lived in these [wicked courses] ἀπελουσάμεθα, ‘*have been washed*. But those who wash themselves’ (ἀπολούοντες) in intemperance, ἐκ σωφροσύνης εἰς πορνείαν βαπτίζουσι, do from a state ‘of temperance wash themselves in fornication.’ He says, *dip* into fornication; though λούω used twice in the same sentence, and by himself rendered *wash*, should have directed him by the likeness of the phrase, and by the apodosis, to have rendered the last clause so too.

An antipædobaptist who should read this collection would be discouraged, and think there are no places to be found where βαπτίζω is used for proper dipping, since this poor author can find no better than these. But it is pretty to observe, that he does bring at last a passage of Gregory Thaumaturgus, where βαπτίζόμενος is really taken for a man in the water, sunk, or sinking, and so is for his turn, if he had known how to translate it. Gregory speaks, it seems, of somebody who ἄλλοις ὀρέγων χεῖρα διασώσῃτο, ὥσπερ βαπτίζομένους ἀνιμώμενος, ‘to others stretching out his hand should ‘save them, as one that with a rope hales out men that are sinking in ‘the water’ [or sunk]. He renders it, ‘immersed in difficulties.’ It is a pity a man should have in a collection of passages but one that was pertinent, and not know which it was. The loss however is not great, for we own that is often taken for being in the water.

But what places of Scripture does he produce, which was the thing expected?

Only these: *Can ye be baptized with the baptism &c.*, (which Mr. Gale had rejected:) *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, &c.*: and *They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*: and he says, ‘Can these passages——justify any man in denying ‘the word signifies only *to dip*?’ I thought he would have brought some that should justify his affirming it. Mr. Gale had better have thrown away this letter.

Page 120. That which follows here for two pages, about πίνω, to drink; *in Belgium navigare*, to go to Holland; *hæredes morere*, &c., is such stuff, that if a Hollander wrote it, and thought we would read it in a question of divinity, he must think us men of great leisure and patience. At last he excuses himself for inserting these particulars, which may seem too trifling, &c., for ‘that Mr. Wall

‘and others having urged them against us,’ &c. Has the man any modesty left? Did I ever urge any of these things?

Page 121. He takes here a safe course to speak something to the purpose, by saying what hundreds of learned men have said before him, of whom I quoted several. He did ill to mix it in one chapter with his impertinent remarks. For it is a serious thing, that the argument has solidity in it, to evince that where baptism can with safety to the health be administered by dipping, it should be so done. How large a signification soever the word βαπτίζω may have to signify *washing in general*; it is plain that the ordinary and general practice of St. John, the apostles, and primitive church was to baptize by putting the person into the water, or causing him to go into the water. Neither do I know of any protestant who has denied it, and but very few men of learning that have denied that where it can be used with safety of health, it is the most fitting way. So that where he speaks of ‘little frivolous cavils,’ [p. 123,] that have been made against some of the texts he brings to prove it to have been the ancient practice, I know not whom he should mean, unless perhaps some few *presbyterian* writers. I hope he will not pretend that this too is written against me, who had owned and urged the same thing in the book that he is writing against; and therefore he spends time and four or five pages to no purpose, in quoting not only several ancient books, but I know not how many now, or then, living, Dr. Whitby, Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Jurieu, &c., to prove this. I suppose he thought to do the men an honour, and to gain their favour, by reciting their words with encomiums, (and from one of them he has obtained his purpose<sup>i</sup>;) however it is a frivolous thing for men to quote one another for a thing that is confessed by all.

But whereas he carries the argument farther, and says to this effect, p. 121, that the practice of St. John, the apostles, &c., has determined the signification of the word, as it relates to the sacrament of baptism, that cannot be; for βαπτίζω may signify *washing in general*; though they used ordinarily that particular sort of washing. As in the other sacrament, when Christ gave the bread and wine, and commanded his apostles (and in them all Christians) to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him: this does not determine the sense of the words *eat, drink, bread, wine*, to all the

<sup>i</sup> [Perhaps Dr. Wall alludes to the favourable manner in which Dr. Whitby speaks of Mr. Gale in his ‘Full Answer to the Argument of the Rev. Jo. Edwards,’ &c. 8°. London, 1712, where, in

the preface, page 4, he says, ‘full worthy of a serious consideration are those words of a *very learned antipadobaptist*, quoting Mr. Gale, p. 1, and again, p. 6.



particular circumstances then used ; as that *bread* must signify only *unleavened bread*, or just such a degree of fineness, or such a quantity of the bread as they did then eat : or that *eating* and *drinking* must signify only such eating and drinking as is after supper in an upper room, and on a passover night, &c. So our Saviour's command here has no more than the general word *baptize* or *wash*. And John's washing him in a river does not determine the sense of the word to any particular circumstance then used : as the quantity of water, a river, one of thirty years old, &c.

Our Saviour seems to have used in his command the general words, *eat*, *drink*, *wash*, that he might not determine any particular circumstances which may in some cases happen to be impracticable.

As to the manner of baptism then generally used, the texts produced by our author, and by every one that speaks of these matters, John iii. 23, Mark i. 5, Acts viii. 38, are undeniable proofs that the baptized person went ordinarily into the water, and sometimes the baptist too. We should not know by these accounts whether the whole body of the baptized was put under water, head and all ; were it not for two later proofs, which seem to me to put it out of question.

One, that St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism *a burial* ; which allusion is not so proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the armpits, &c., as it is if their whole body was immersed.

The other, the custom of the Christians in the near succeeding times ; which being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally, or ordinarily, a total immersion of the naked body ; and that (as this author observes, and I had shewn) thrice repeated.

But no man will pretend that this practice has limited and determined the sense of the word *baptize* to all these circumstances. Mr. Gale himself would not have it limited to a total immersion, nor most of the Minnists.

This was the way ordinarily used ; but none of these evidences does evince that it was the *only* way then used, without exception for any extraordinary case, of sickness, tender constitution, coldness of season or climate ; or of haste, want of a sufficient quantity of water, and many other cases which may be supposed, or rather must be supposed, sometimes to happen.

For 1st, as to the argument from St. Paul's allusion to a burial :

if it were the *ordinary* way to bury the baptized person in the water, that is abundantly sufficient to ground an allusion upon. Such metaphorical speeches are never taken to be strictly argumentative in respect to all the particulars without exception. The apostle in those two places styles it *a burial*; but in one of them Col. ii. 12, he calls it *a circumcision*, (*the circumcision of Christ*, i. e. appointed by Christ, or a *Christian circumcision*;) in more direct words than he does a burial. For he is there satisfying the Colossians that in Christ they are sufficiently circumcised, &c., being *by the circumcision of Christ buried with him in baptism*. Yet from this place the men of our author's kidney cannot see that baptism must have any likeness to circumcision at all; but *a burial* it must resemble in all cases, without exception for any cause that is never so reasonable. But these are arguings, not of men that desire to be guided by Scripture, but that plead for a side. Besides, Mr. Gale, and those that allow of a partial dipping to be the *dipping* of the man, must find out some such interpretation for *burying* him too, or else they must not urge this allusion so close as they do.

2nd. Another reason, that from those few instances of baptism by the apostles, which appear to have been administered by going into the water, we should not absolutely conclude that they never in any case of necessity administered it otherwise, is taken from the practice of the ancient Christians; who lived nigh after their times, and had much better means than we have of knowing how the apostles or their deputies managed in such cases, and would not have used clinical baptism to the sick and weak, (as I shewed that they did,) if they had not had reason to judge, that the apostles did the like in such cases; though it be not recorded in Scripture: there being no instance in Scripture of any one at all baptized in cold countries, nor of any baptized in sickness, which yet must often happen.

3rd. A main and chief reason is, because our Saviour has, as I said, given a rule, Matt. xii. 3, 4, 7, that what is necessary to preserve life, is to be preferred before outward ceremonies. This author grants, at

Page 127, that 'this foundation is certainly very good.' But to shew that he makes this concession to an ill purpose, he adds, 'And they might from hence justify their forbearing to administer this sacrament at all.' What is this, but straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel? Our Saviour has expressly commanded every one that would be saved, to be baptized; and every one that enters into the kingdom of heaven must, he says, be born again of water,

&c. Now shall any arrogant mortal determine that this need not be? And in cases of necessity, where the person cannot have it in that way that he thinks the fittest, not let him have it at all? God Almighty in the time of Moses determined otherwise in the case of the passover: and so did Hezekiah afterward. 'The ancients,' he says, 'who introduced affusion, seemed unwilling to carry the matter so far. In present danger of death, they thought it necessary that all should be made partakers,' &c. God Almighty keep us in the same modesty and awe for our Saviour's commands, that the ancients had.

Page 128. From this place forward to p. 130, he uses a ridiculous and tedious argument, (wherein his own comparisons make against him,) all built on a supposition that I should say, that it is perfectly indifferent in all cases which way baptism is administered, whether by immersion or perfusion; and then fights against that supposition with arguments taken from the *Toleration Act*. The reader will have the curiosity to see by what wonderful faculty he can fetch any thing thence to this purpose; and if he do, he will see a specimen of the gentleman's talent in that way.

But the supposition is all his own. I never said any such thing. In the book that he had before his eyes, I do plainly grant, and even urge it, that dipping, where it may safely be used, is the *most fitting* manner, part ii. chap. 8; and in the next chapter had spent several pages to shew the *preference* of that before the other, (except in cases of danger to health,) and that preference owned by all churches, (except the *Roman* and *Generan*,) and particularly by the church of *England*. In the management of his argument, he observes, that a law should not be interpreted by the exceptions that are made in it. True. Not in ordinary cases. But in the excepted cases it should.

Page 131. He treats St. Cyprian with his usual dirt, as freely as he does any of us. And for no other reason, but because a letter of his is yet extant, wherein he gives his opinion to one that had asked it, that perfusion, or aspersion, in cases of necessity is sufficient baptism: of which letter I gave a copy. Presently this writer falls into a fit of slighting and vilifying in his arrogant way that great bishop and martyr, as arguing after a 'very frivolous manner,' &c.

Whoever reads it will see that St. Cyprian's reasons, 'That the main thing in baptism in God's sight is the dedicating the person to God and his Gospel; that the contagion of sin is not washed off by the same measures that the dirt of the skin is, &c., so that there should be a necessity for a large pool, &c. It is another way

‘that the breast of a believer is washed; that the mind is sanctified,’ &c.; are much to the same purpose as St. Peter’s saying, *Baptism saves us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but* &c. And as St. Paul says, The niceties about meats, &c., *have not profited those that have been exercised therein*, but he that in the main things serveth God is accepted of him; so St. Cyprian argues, that ‘many who are baptized in sickness, when need so requires, are freed from the unclean spirit, and do live commendably, &c., and do by the increase of faith proceed,’ &c. This certainly is the substance, and the quantity of water with which one is washed is but the outward ceremony. Yet our author, beside a great deal of other contemptuous language, says, ‘he determines the matter, not only without, but directly contrary to, the whole tenor of the New Testament.’ [p. 131.] As if the ‘whole tenor of the New Testament’ were about the quantity of water in baptism. But indeed this way of braving, hectoring, and vilifying any adversary, (be it a *Cyprian*, or be it a Quaker, it is all one with him,) is the best tool that this disputant has. Take this from him, and a much meaner man than a *Father* might stand the brunt of his arguments. He, at

Page 133, confronts St. Cyprian with an argument from one of the forementioned texts that speaks of burial. Rom. vi. 2, 3; *So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death*. This, he says, ‘is as plain as words can make it; that all without exception,’ &c.

He is fain to patch two propositions into one to make his argument. But the direct answer is, that St. Paul had not in his aim there the way or manner of baptism. And therefore the phrase, *so many as*, so far as it respects the metaphor of burial, is used (as the word *all* in Scripture very often is) in a sense that includes the generality, but not always *all without exception*.

Page 134. He excepts against the quotations which I had brought from the ancients for baptism by affusion in cases of sickness or other necessity, as being too late, one hundred and fifty years after the apostles.

This, for want of any better defence, and because he cannot deny the facts, is said only to make a colour in the eyes of an ignorant reader. For all men of learning do know, and he himself knows, that this is an early date for any quotation; and especially for any thing that concerns the ceremonial parts of religion; the few books that are ancients being taken up with matters of faith, practice, and exhortations to constancy, &c., too much to have any thing in



them of the quantity of water used in the baptism of sick people. He himself will fill his pages with authors much later than St. *Cyprian's* time, and boast of them, if they speak of baptism by *immersion*, as he does in this chapter. And Mr. Gale, p. 327, 345, recommends the evidence of the first three centuries to determine this controversy.

Page 135. He observes, as I had done before him, that men baptized in sickness by affusion were, by the rules of those times, not admitted, if they recovered, to holy orders. And makes a very ignorant blunder in translating a passage in Petavius to that purpose, *ibid.*

Petavius says, They that were so baptized *were accounted irregular*. This author not knowing the meaning of the word (though it be of very common use in church-laws, to signify one *incapable of orders*) translated it, 'such were thought irregularly baptized.' That ran in the man's head.

He should also have owned the true reason, why such were *irregular*, not for the manner of their baptism, but because they would not take baptism till they were affrighted by approaching death. This is both by some of the ancients, as I shewed, declared to be the reason, and is of itself of such weight as to make a good reason. For there is not nigh so good ground to hope well of a profession of faith and repentance first made in a fright, and by necessity, as there is of a voluntary one. Whereas the other is but a ceremonial difference.

And whereas he argues, p. 135, that the canon of Neocæsarea which I cited, being eighty years after that time, could not influence the judgment of the church at that time, I grant it. But that canon did not enjoin that as a new law, but established it as an ancient canon or rule of the church. Which Mr. Gale might have observed from the words of Eusebius which himself cites, who speaking of the times when Novatian's case was debated, says, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξὸν ἦν τὸν ἐν κλίνῃ διὰ νόσον περιχυθῆντα εἰς κλῆρον τινὰ γενέσθαι. 'It was not lawful that any one, who *by reason of sickness* was baptized *in his bed* by perfusion, should be taken into any office of the clergy.'

He might have seen this to be their reason by what himself cites of the history of Novatus written by Cornelius (if he had understood, or would have rightly applied the words). Cornelius there gives an account to Fabius, how this Novatus had been a heathen; and that the occasion of his believing was, his being possessed with a devil for a long time; in which he being something helped by the exorcisms (or prayers) of some Christian priests, would be baptized

before he died. And having gone on to tell what sort of Christian he made in his conversation afterward, a trickish, juggling, and forsworn fellow, &c., and afterward returning to speak of his baptism, which he took in that fright of approaching death, and had so abused afterward, he says, ‘He received it by affusion in his bed, as ‘he lay, εἰ γὰρ χρὴ λέγειν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι, if it be fit to say, that ‘such a one as he received it at all.’ Where the stress of Cornelius’ doubt or question concerning his baptism is plainly grounded on the ill temper of the man’s heart, and his receiving it by fright and necessity, and his ill life afterward, and not on the manner of washing.

I gave here the instance of St. Laurence out of Walafrid Strabo, baptizing with a pitcher of water in a case of necessity; and of Basilides out of Eusebius. To which he says nothing. Neither did I say that Novatian’s case is the earliest, (as he falsely quotes my words,) but that that and the rest there given are some of the earliest.

Page 136. He brings in Constantine’s baptism to no manner of purpose. For though he says of his own head that Eusebius affirms, that ‘he was not baptized in his bed, but, as was usual, in the ‘church, called *Martyrium Christi*, in the ordinary way;’ there is nothing of that matter said in Eusebius, only that he went to the suburbs of Nicomedia, called together the bishops, desired of them baptism, οἱ δὲ τὰ νόμιμα τελοῦντες, &c. ‘And they performing the ‘ceremonies, put in execution the Divine ordinance, and made him partaker,’ &c. ὥσα χρὴ προσδιαστείλαμενοι: which I render, ‘having ‘enjoined (or required of him) such things as ought to be enjoined,’ i. e. the baptismal professions.

Now from which of these expressions he concludes the immersion, I know not. I am afraid, because Eusebius says in the next words, ‘and so Constantine, the only man of all the emperors that ever ‘were Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίοις ἀναγεννώμενος, being regenerated in (or ‘by) the testimonies (or ordinances) of Christ, was baptized;’ this translator concludes from μαρτυρίοις Χριστοῦ that he was baptized in a church called *Martyrium Christi* (which name whether any church at Nicodemia had, I know not). We must not suspect such a thing of Mr. Gale; but I question, as I said, whether this letter be his. But if it were so, (as I think it probable he was baptized in a church,) might it not be by *perfusion*, if he was very weak? Neither was he so weak then, but that he had lately travelled from Constantinople thither. If he was baptized in a church, that makes a good proof that he was not baptized by immersion, but as sick

men were wont, by *affusion* of water on his face. For Mr. Bingham has well proved by several ancient testimonies, that in those times the *κολυμβήθραι*, the cisterns or pools made for people to go into at their baptism, were not in the church, but in an out-building, called *βαπτιστήριον*<sup>k</sup> or *φωτιστήριον*, at some distance from the church. And indeed it cannot well be conceived that such large ponds of water as they ordinarily had for hundreds of men to go in at a time, could conveniently be made in the body of the church.

Page 138. He brings in an English council in the year 816, (which I had helped him to<sup>l</sup>.) that children should be dipped in the font. And presently adds, ‘But what need is there to urge this?’ None at all, since he wilfully left out the word *infants*.

Page 140. He makes a great reach to fetch in a compliment (which I take to be a begging one) for bishop Burnet. He takes a saying of his, ‘That the danger of dipping in cold climates may be ‘a very good reason for changing the form of baptism to sprinkling.’ And says, ‘This excuse is now become very common, and——has ‘gathered considerable force by being used by men of his lordship’s ‘good sense and learning.’ Fulsome! was it ever omitted by any, who, before he or the bishop were born, have pleaded for perfusion? As for *sprinkling* indeed, I am content that he should be counted one of the first of the church of England who ever recommended it. After all, he brings not one word of refutation of the bishop’s reason from the coldness of the climate. There is nothing else here, save that at

Page 138 he repeats, as he had three or four times before, that slander on me, which I mentioned, that I ‘do pretend that baptism ‘may be administered *indifferently* in any manner.’ I think he judges, that a false thing by being often repeated will become true. I have always held and taught, that where it may with safety be administered in that way of dipping, which St. John and the apostles in those hot countries used, that way ought to be preferred. In cases of haste, want of a quantity of water, or danger to health, *pouring* of water to be sufficient; and indeed in the case of danger of health, the best way; for *God will have mercy and not sacrifice*. As for *sprinkling*, I say, as Mr. Blake<sup>m</sup> did at its first coming up in England, ‘Let them defend it that use it.’

Our Saviour gave his last supper in unleavened bread. Many churches do therefore prefer that. But all (even those that use it)

<sup>k</sup> [Compare what is said at part ii. p. 571.]

<sup>l</sup> [See part ii. p. 578.]

<sup>m</sup> [See some account of Mr. Blake, a writer of the age of king Charles I., at part ii. p. 581.]

will agree that, when that cannot conveniently be had, it is sufficient to receive it in common bread. That common bread ought to be as fine and white as conveniently can be gotten, (for such, no doubt, the passover bread was,) but who will say, that in cases of necessity a coarser sort is not sufficient? The essence of the symbols, as to religious use, and our Saviour's true meaning, does not consist in these things.

The Scripture recommends *pure* (or clean) water for baptism, Heb. x. 22, and such, no doubt, is the fittest. Yet the antipædobaptists, who stand so much on the *quantity*, are easily satisfied with the *quality* of the water; when (whether for necessity, or choice, I know not) they use the water at *Horsleydown*<sup>n</sup>, and such like puddled places. Shall any one start up a new schism among them, and endeavour to persuade some of their ignorant people that their baptism is invalid, because their bodies were washed not with *pure* water, (which the Scripture speaks of,) but dirty?

Page 139. This chapter concludes, like all the rest, with a boasting triumph. 'Thus have I made it plain—that the word βαπτίζω '—always signifies only *to dip* or *plunge*.' And he has the confidence to say, that he has proved it 'from the constant use of it in 'the New Testament.' Whereas he has not brought one word of sense to weaken the proofs to the contrary that I brought from the New Testament; and particularly that from Luke xi. But he has a new way of gaining his point, as he calls it. He sets up an image of a judge of his own making, (whom he calls *sir*,) and to him he makes a bow, and says, 'You see, sir, that I proved it all.' Then the image, I suppose, gives a gracious nod, and so the case is decided. Should not the antipædobaptists rather set up somebody that might write, as Mr. Tombes and Mr. Stennet did, better sense in more modest expressions; stronger reasons with less declamation? Would not that convince any rational inquirer sooner than this vaunting and insulting way, which always puts more in the conclusion than was proved by the premises or middle terms of the argument; a way that never prevails upon any but weak reasoners, and men prejudiced, right or wrong, for a side?

<sup>n</sup> In Crosby's 'History of the English 'Baptists,' vol. iv. p. 189, there is given a particular account of the great βαπτιστήριον, or 'baptizing-place,' with a preaching-house, &c., which was erected here, and duly registered according to Act of Parliament, in the year 1717.

[Horsleydown is a district of the borough of Southwark: it anciently belonged to the parish of St. Olave's, but

was formed into a distinct parish in the year 1733.

It seems that the anabaptists had fixed themselves here in considerable numbers. In the year 1775 there were four meeting-houses of that persuasion. In 1714 a school was established by Protestant dissenters of different denominations, for the children of poor persons.—*Manning and Bray's History of Surrey*, vol. iii. p. 613.]



If this letter were writ by another, and sent to Mr. Gale, he accounted it imperfect, as wanting an ornament with which all his are graced; and that is, a fit of railing at the clergy of the church. He would not have it omitted here, and therefore has inserted it even after the foresaid conclusion. He observes,

Page 139, ‘The clergy allow that dipping was the ancient manner—in all common cases at least—and have wished that this custom might be again restored among us here in England, as it continued till about queen Elizabeth’s time.’ And then presently adds two falsehoods.

One, the forementioned one repeated again. ‘Why, after all these concessions, do they pretend it is indifferent?’

To order dipping in all cases where the party may well bear it; and pouring of water, only where he cannot, (as the church of England does,) is not to pretend it indifferent.

The other follows it at the heels. ‘They continue in the constant use and practice of aspersion, &c., and defend it in opposition to immersion.’

To defend aspersion in opposition to immersion, is as much as to say or maintain, that aspersion is fitting, is lawful, &c., but immersion is not; or, to refuse or dissuade people from the dipping of their children, though the parents own them to be able to endure it. Which whether any clergyman in *England* has been ignorant enough to do, I know not. If he has, he has gone contrary to his promise of conformity to the liturgy. But to affix this upon the clergy in general, as he does, is for certain a notorious reproach and untruth. Beside two lesser untruths in that one sentence; one in saying, *aspersion* (which the church does not allow in any case) instead of *perfusion*. The other, when speaking of the clergy in general, he calls it their ‘constant use and practice.’ Whereas several clergymen have prevailed on some of their people to have their children dipped in baptism, as the rubric directs; and some of the people have of themselves desired it, and it has been practised accordingly<sup>o</sup>.

But none of these expressions have as yet come up to Mr. Gale’s usual strain. Therefore after much rambling talk on this matter, he at

Page 141 expresses it thus; ‘So that, notwithstanding their pretences, it is to be feared the clergy are a great cause of the corruption, and its continuance.’ And in the contents he says

<sup>o</sup> [See part ii. p. 581, where Dr. Wall relates that he himself had in one instance administered baptism by *immersion*, with the parents’ consent.]

positively, ‘They in reality obstruct its (the ancient practice) being ‘revived.’ [p. 116.] That I take to be Mr. Gale’s own language, and it resembles the style of an *observer*<sup>v</sup>, or *flying post*.

To what he would here beg, that we should take βάπτω, to *dip* or *dye*, instead of βαπτίζω the Scripture word, I gave answer before.

Now I have gone through the work that this writer has dragged me into, by putting my name to the top of his pages, and here and there into his reasonings about matters in which I was concerned as little as possible. And almost half his book is over before he comes to speak of infant-baptism; the history whereof was my only subject. And he has gained this advantage, that he has made me weary before any trial of that begins.

If I do give any of my sentiments concerning the difficulties which the clergy do find in bringing the people to that way of baptism, which the rubric orders in the case of children that may well endure it: I would not have it taken as spoken in answer to this man’s insolent demand. For I think that when one in his station does in a malapert and factious manner demand of his superiors an account of the reason of their actions, as if he were a bishop or a judge over them, (as he does here; ‘Why don’t they ‘take proper methods? Why do they continue,’ &c.) he deserves no other answer than such as the Pharisees used to have from our Saviour to their haughty and illmeant interrogatives.

But if I may be admitted in a submissive manner to take this opportunity (which is the last I can have) to give to my brethren of the clergy a scheme of my thoughts on this difficulty:

I must own in the first place that many of the clergy seem to be of the opinion of the late bishop of Salisbury, (whom Mr. Gale here quotes,) that the coldness of our climate is a good reason to change *dipping* into (*sprinkling* he says, but a respect for the rubric would have directed him to say) *pouring* of water, in the case of all children weak or strong, and of all weathers, warm or cold; for so they seem to mean.

To these brethren I have no more to say, than to propose these few things to their consideration.

That our climate is no colder than it was for those thirteen or fourteen hundred years from the beginning of Christianity here to queen Elizabeth’s time; and not near so cold as Muscovy, and some

<sup>v</sup> [Probably the allusion is to a political publication of Roger L’Estrange, which under the title of ‘The Observer’

was issued during the years 1684 to 1687, amounting altogether to three moderate folio volumes.]

other countries where they do still *dip* their children in baptism, and find no inconvenience in it.

That the apparent reason that altered the custom was, not the coldness of the climate, but the imitation of Calvin, and the church of Geneva, and some others thereabouts.

That our reformers and compilers of the liturgy (even of the last edition<sup>9</sup> of it) were of another mind. As appears both by the express order of the rubric itself; and by the prayer used just before baptism, ‘Sanctify this water, &c., and grant that this child now to be baptized *THEREIN*,’ &c.; (if they had meant that pouring should have always or most ordinarily have been used, they would have said *THEREWITH*;) and by the definition given in the Catechism of the outward visible sign in baptism; ‘Water, *wherein* the person is ‘baptized.’ I know that in one edition it was said, ‘is dipped or ‘sprinkled with it.’ I know not the history of that edition; but as it is a late one, so it was not thought fit to be continued. The old edition had the prayer before said in these words, ‘baptized in this ‘water.’

That if it be the coldness of the *air* that is feared; a child brought in loose blankets, that may be presently put off and on, need be no longer naked, or very little longer than at its ordinary dressing and undressing; not a quarter or sixth part of a minute.

If the coldness of the *water*, there is no reason, from the nature of the thing, no order or command of God or man, that it should be used cold; but as the waters, in which our Saviour and the primitive Christians in those hot countries which the Scripture mentions were baptized, were naturally warm by reason of the climate; so if ours be made warm, they will be the liker to them. As the inward and main part of baptism is God’s washing and sanctifying the soul, so the outward symbol is the washing of the body, which is as naturally done by warm water as cold. It may, I suppose, be used in such degree of warmth as the parents desire.

2. As to those of the clergy who are satisfied themselves, and do in their own minds and opinions approve of the directions of the liturgy, and would willingly bring their people to the use of it; it is too apparent what difficulties lie in the way. So that this quarreller has no ground in his assuming way to demand, ‘Why they do continue,’ &c.

The difficulty of breaking any custom which has got possession among the body of the people, (though that custom be but of

<sup>9</sup> [Viz. in Charles the Second’s reign, 1661.]

two or three generations,) is known and obvious. And there being a necessity of leaving it to the parents' judgment, whether their child may well endure dipping or not, they are very apt to think or say *not*: and there is no help for it. For none, I think, will pretend that the minister should determine that, and dip the child whether they will or not. He can but give his opinion, the judgment must be theirs; and they are for doing as has been of late usual.

But there are, beside this general, two particular obstacles, which it may be fit to mention.

1. One is, from that part of the people in any parish who are *presbyterianly* inclined. As the *puritan* party brought in this alteration, so they are very tenacious of it: and as in other church matters, so in this particularly, they seem to have a settled antipathy against the retrieving of the ancient customs. Calvin was, I think, (as I said in my book<sup>1</sup>;) the first in the world that drew up a form of liturgy that prescribed *pouring water* on the infant, absolutely, without saying any thing of *dipping*. It was (as Mr. Walker<sup>s</sup> has shewn) his admirers in England, who in queen Elizabeth's time brought *pouring* into ordinary use, which before was used only to weak children. But the succeeding *presbyterians* in England, about the year 1644, (when their reign began,) went farther yet from the ancient way, and instead of *pouring*, brought into use in many places *sprinkling*: declaring at the same time against all use of fonts, baptisteries, godfathers, or any thing that looked like the ancient way of baptizing. And as they brought the use of the other sacrament to a great and shameful infrequency, (which it is found difficult to this day to reform,) so they brought this of baptism into a great disregard. Now I say, a minister in a parish, where there are any considerable number inclined to this way, will find in them a great aversion to this order of the rubric. They are hardly prevailed on to leave off that scandalous custom of having their children, though never so well, baptized out of a bason or porringer in a bedchamber, hardly persuaded to bring them to church; much farther from having them dipped, though never so able to endure it.

2. Another struggle will be with the midwives and nurses, &c. These will use all the interest they have with the mothers, (which is very great,) to dissuade them from agreeing to the dipping of the child. I know no particular reason, unless it be this. A thing which

<sup>1</sup> [See vol. i. p. 580.]

<sup>s</sup> [An extract from Mr. Walker's publication on this subject is given at vol. i. p. 579, 581.]



they value themselves and their skill much upon is, the neat dressing of the child on the christening day<sup>t</sup>; the setting all the trimming, the pins, and the laces in their right order. And if the child be brought in loose clothes, which may presently be taken off for the baptism, and put on again; this pride is lost. And this makes a reason. So little is the solemnity of the sacrament regarded by many, who mind nothing but the dress, and the eating and drinking. But the minister must endeavour to prevail with some of his people who have the most regard for religion, and possibly their example may bring in the rest.

The consequence that would follow from baptizing children ordinarily by this old way would, I believe, be this; that the schism of antipædobaptism would dwindle and cease. My reasons are,

One which I mentioned in my book, that most of the people that have scruples about their baptism, (as far as I have observed; and it has been my fortune to be often exercised in discoursing with such,) do not near so much question the validity of their baptism, for that it was received in infancy, as they do for that they were not dipped, or put into the water<sup>v</sup>; for which they see so clear examples in Scripture.

But what is far more considerable than any experience of mine, is the observation that may be made from the history of this schism, wherever it has arisen. The *Greek* church, in all the branches of it, in Europe, Asia, Egypt, and Ethiopia, which has always preserved the custom of dipping infants in baptism, that were in health and able to bear it, has accordingly never been molested with any disputes about infant-baptism; nor ever have any antipædobaptists been heard of among them. In the *Latin* church, (which is for extent of countries, and, as I think, for number of Christians, much less than the *Greek*;) as France<sup>x</sup> was the first country that left off dipping in the ordinary baptisms; so there it was that the first antipædobaptists in the world (the Petrobrusians about the twelfth century) arose<sup>y</sup>. Germany and Holland afterward had their share of trouble with this sect; but not till they also had, almost generally, left off the dipping of infants. England all this while kept to the old way. And though several times some Dutch anabaptists came over hither during those times, endeavouring to make proselytes here; yet Foxe the historian in queen Elizabeth's time declares, that he

<sup>t</sup> [See some observations on this point at vol. i. p. 584.]

<sup>u</sup> [See vol. i. p. 535.]

<sup>x</sup> [See vol. i. p. 480, 576.]

<sup>y</sup> [See vol. i. p. 492.]

never heard of any Englishman that was perverted by them. So that antipædobaptism did not begin here while dipping in the ordinary baptisms lasted. Then for two reigns pouring water on the face of the infant was most in fashion, and some few of the people turned antipædobaptists, but did not make a separation for it. They never had any considerable numbers here, till the *presbyterian* reign began. These men (out of opposition to the church of England, I think) brought the external part of this sacrament to a less significant symbol than Calvin himself had done, (for he directs pouring of water on the face,) and in most places changed *pouring* to *sprinkling*. This scandalized many people, and indeed it was, and is really scandalous. So partly that, and partly the gap that was then set open for all sects that would, to propagate themselves, gave the rise to this: which I therefore think, as I said, would upon our return to the church of England way, cease. However, they cannot upbraid the pourers or sprinklers with the novelty of that fashion, for, as new as it is, it is older than their religion in England is. This history, with the annals and proofs of it, I gave more largely in my book, part ii. chap. 9. § 2.

---

## CHAP. VI.

HE first lays down an absurd supposition, p. 142. If Mr. Wall had argued such and such things, (which things are nonsense,) and then adds, ‘Of the same kind exactly—are the two main foundations of infant-baptism; I mean the celebrated arguments from ‘original sin, and from circumcision.’ I would have any one that does not know this author, to guess at the make of his face by this and such-like insolent speeches of his.

The Scripture, and our own woful experience, makes us sensible of our original corruption; which needs cleansing and forgiveness. And as baptism is the sacrament of cleansing and forgiveness; the Christians in all ages have understood it to have that effect in infants, whom the same Scripture and experience shews to have that corruption innate in them as well as others; except Pelagius and a few followers of his, who used infant-baptism for other purposes. This has been discoursed largely by several of the ancient Christians; particularly St. Austin in large volumes.

And so likewise the Scripture speaks of our baptism, as being the *Christian circumcision*, or the *circumcision of Christ*, Col. ii. And as circumcision belonged to infants, as a seal of entrance into covenant

with God ; and baptism has the effect of circumcision ; the consequence of its belonging to infants is by Christians, ancient and modern, largely deduced.

Now here steps up a new author, who thinks to overthrow these doctrines by mocking at them, and at all the Christian world ; and with a scornful smile at such ‘ trifling foundations of infant-baptism,’ puffs them away at one breath, and in three or four lines. A vulgar reader presently thinks, surely this is a great scholar. Yes, or else a very proud and assuming boaster, such as is described, Prov. xxi. 24.

He says, these two arguments ‘ have been often baffled.’

Was there ever any antipædobaptist that pretended to answer (to name no more) those books of St. Austin (which I mentioned) against the Pelagians, which, though not written to prove infant-baptism, (which no Christian then denied,) yet do prove original sin to be the doctrine of the universal church from its practice of infant-baptism ; and so do shew the connection between the two doctrines ? So far have they been from answering or baffling, that I believe none of them (except perhaps Mr. Tombes) ever read them.

Page 143. He comes to me. And after a smoothing compliment, he in the next words sets up against me one of the falsest accusations, and most abominable calumnies, that in all the seventy years of my life was ever thrown upon me by any lewd or slanderous tongue or pen. He makes me a teacher of false doctrine, contrary to the principles of the church of which I am a member, and contrary to what I have always taught therein, and contrary to what I declare in many places of the book he had before him. A doctrine that was never maintained by any Christian, (beside the antipædobaptists themselves,) but by some late papists ; viz. that I ‘ freely ‘ allow that it cannot be made appear from the Scriptures, that infants are to be baptized.’

He has in the foregoing parts of his book used many uncivil taunts and reproaches, unhandsome and rude expressions, and such as (considering from whom they come) may well be called arrogant ; some of which I have noted, some I passed by. He also spent his first two chapters on my character, as he calls it, picking up from any hands pitiful personal stories of no moment to the matter in hand, nor indeed to any thing else, but to shew a temper that is by all men counted scandalous and contemptible in a writer of controversy. But all these I count as nothing in comparison of this impudent slander.

His way is (as I noted before in another instance) the falser any thing is that he says, to say it over and over again so much the oftener. This therefore being a notorious untruth, and contrary to what he saw with his own eyes, and to what he must think the reader would see, needed to be repeated a great many times to make it pass. And he does repeat it at least twenty times in this one chapter. All which repetitions are so many——.

I shall recite some of them. I thought to have set them down all, that they might fly in his face. But it is too tedious and loathsome. I will note the pages of them all.

Page 143. The words I now recited. Page 144. Having quoted some of my words, (but those curtailed,) he adds, ‘All which is, in short, to grant that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture.’ Page 145. ‘You may be pleased to observe his *concession*; which is a very unhappy one for him.’ Ibid. The same slander again: ‘Mr. Wall confesses,’ &c. Page 146. The same repeated three or four times. Page 147. ‘Mr. Wall has ruined his whole design by what he lays down at first. For if infant-baptism cannot be found in Scripture, as he confesses:’ and another in that page of the same. Pages 148, 150. More of the same. Page 150. ‘Pædobaptism, which Mr. Wall confesses cannot be proved from Scripture.’ Ibid. Over again. Page 151. ‘Mr. Wall, or any man who owns infant-baptism cannot be maintained but by the traditions of the church, and yet practises it.’ Ibid. Over again. See more, pages 153, 155, 158.

If I had said any such thing as these accusations amount to, I ought to take shame to myself. But if all this be notoriously false, the antipædobaptists ought to disown such a defender of their cause, as could not do it without the help of a gross untruth in matter of fact, at the beginning; and to take care to employ next one that, beside a faculty of declaiming, has learned to speak truth.

I have been forced by this foul and importunate cavil to look over those places of my own book, where I do enforce the proof of infant-baptism from several texts of Scripture. For though I declared in the preface, that ‘the arguments from Scripture for each side of this controversy having been so searched, and so often bandied to and fro, that not much more could be said to illustrate them,’ my purpose was to take it for my task to write the *history* of the *practice* of the ancient Christians in this matter; and accordingly I, as an historian, did in many places forbear arguing from Scripture: yet in some other places, where the Fathers, whose



words I recited, did quote or refer to such texts of Scripture as do naturally confirm the doctrine of infant-baptism; it was necessary for me, in the *notes* on such passages, to shew how those texts do agree with, and illustrate the discourses of those ancients. Hence it came to pass, that though the main scope of my book was history, and not argument, yet I did (occasionally and by the way) bring many proofs from God's word, which stand as so many evidences of the falsehood of this foul charge against me.

I need not repeat them, because Mr. Gale's readers must of course have my book, or else they read an answer to they know not what; for he does greatly misrepresent it. I will refer to the places.

On the text, Matthew xxviii. 19, *all nations*, &c., I shew that it ought to be understood of *all the persons* of which the nations are composed, infants as well as their parents. And do endeavour to clear this sense from the evasions of the antipædobaptists. Introduction, § 5. Book, part ii. chap. 10. § 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 1. item § 3. N<sup>o</sup>. 4.

Of that saying of our Saviour, John iii. 3, 5, I have spoken more often and more largely, because the ancient Christians do hardly ever omit it; and shewn that it concerns *all* persons, infant or adult, and can be understood in no other sense than to mean, or connote baptism, nor ever was otherwise understood by the ancients: and that the new interpretation of Calvin and his followers (who expound the *water* mentioned there by our Saviour quite away) is unreasonable, far-fetched, and Quaker-like. Introduct. § 6, Book, part i. chap. 11. § 4. chap. 3. § 2, 3, 4, 5. chap. 6. § 14. part ii. chap. 6. § 1. chap. x. § 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 2, 3. item § 3. N<sup>o</sup>. 5.

The proof from circumcision which was appointed to infants, and that St. Paul does call baptism the Christian circumcision, Col. ii. 11, 12, I do urge and apply part i. chap. 11. § 2, where Justin Martyr himself applies it so. And likewise part ii. chap. 10. § 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 5.

The command of our Saviour, that infants should be brought to him, Mark x. 13, &c., is insisted on, part i. chap. 4. § 10. And at the same place I shew that infants are expressly ordered to be entered into God's covenant, from Deut. xxix. 10.

And in a larger manner than the rest, I do enforce to this purpose the argument from 1 Cor. vii. 14. And having learned from the Fathers the ancient interpretation of that text, (which to a diligent reader of the place will, I think, appear to be the true one,) I do shew the reasonableness of that interpretation, (which directly proves the children of those Corinthian Christians to have

been baptized,) and its agreement with the scope of St. Paul's discourse in the context.

I have had the acknowledgment of some great and learned men, that I have been instrumental in retrieving and confirming from the ancient Christians the true sense thereof, which had been unobserved by most moderns, and misapplied by the antipædobaptists to a very improbable, jejune meaning, inconsistent with the scope of the place. This was visible in my book, part i. chap. 11. § 11. chap. xv. § 2. chap. xviii. § 4. chap. xix. § 19. part ii. chap. 10. § 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 9. item § 3. N<sup>o</sup>. 6.

These proofs from Scripture Mr. Gale had not only seen in my book, but spends a great part of his in confuting and answering them, as well as he can after his way; which renders the falsehood of his saying that none were pretended by me, absurd as well as slanderous.

I had also, long before Mr. Gale wrote, published a little treatise on the question of infant-baptism, wherein I insist chiefly and almost only on *Scripture proof*<sup>z</sup>. I cannot be sure that he had seen it; but he will hardly persuade any one used to such sort of writings that he had not, because those that write against any book do generally take into consideration any other book written by the same man on the same subject, (but he indeed would not take notice of so much as my second edition of the same book.) This also might have contributed to discourage him (if he had been troubled with modesty) from saying a thing of me which the world knows to be false; for two editions, of about two thousand each, of that little piece were then extant.

However, there is in what he had before him, enough to have made him ashamed to say in the contents of this chapter, and repeat it so many times in the chapter itself, 'Mr. Wall allows it cannot be made appear from Scripture. He owns it cannot be shewn to be founded in Scripture, nor be maintained but by the traditions of the church. That the Scripture is silent in the case.'

He himself at one place in the chapter, p. 146, owns enough to have shamed himself, and stopped his mouth from repeating the slander again and again afterward. He says there that 'I do suppose (so he in his proud and contemptuous manner calls my proofs) 'that in some general expressions infants are to be included,

<sup>z</sup> [The piece alluded to is Dr. Wall's 'Conference on the subject of Infant-baptism:' which appeared first in 1706,

and again in 1708; and has been frequently reprinted to the present day.]

‘as in the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, and perhaps in some other passages, and John iii. 5, which,’ he says, ‘I reckon the plainest argument for infant-baptism.’

Why then does he in all the chapter afterward say confidently, that I own that there is no proof (or argument) at all from Scripture? There needs no judges or witnesses, his own mouth condemns him of falsehood in that accusation.

He says of my proofs, that they are ‘but suppositions at best.’ And that ‘to affirm infants are intended as well as adult, in these and such like places, is begging the question, and *asserting* the thing instead of proving it.’

But, good sir, that will not save, or bring off your untruth. For you here deny my *asserting* it. Whether a writer does solidly and effectually prove his point from Scripture, is one question, and whether he does disclaim any Scripture-proof and *confess* there is none, is another. If I say, of any one that brings texts of Scripture for proof of a thing, and applies them as well as he can, that all his texts and arguments upon them do not amount to a good or full proof, that may be true, or it may be false, and be only my ignorance, or incapacity, or prejudice, or haughtiness, and confident *censure*. But if I say positively, and repeat it, and stand to it, that such a man does *own* and *confess* that there is no Scripture-proof for it, I am an open and barefaced liar.

Therefore let that point be decided first, the matter of fact, whether I owned that there is no proof from Scripture. Then afterward, of the validity of the proofs there may be time enough to debate. I should not value myself much upon it, if it should be thought they are (though set down in short, as being not the proper business of that book) such as the man whom you propose to write an answer to my book cannot solidly confute. From you, sir, I do not expect it, since I have seen your faculty of reasoning. If a loose vein of declaiming would do it, you might be the man.

In the next page, p. 147, Mr. Gale says of me, that ‘all that I pretend to is, not that I see it (infant-baptism proved by Scripture) by any necessary inference, but only that *probably* it may be comprehended in some of the more general passages.’

The reader might have guessed at the truth of this tale, by his telling it so many several ways. Is it not intolerable (I may appeal to his own favourers) that an answerer of a book should take the liberty to affix and impute to it what sayings soever he shall forge, and then run on in descant and triumph upon those his own forgeries? If he had said, that the proofs which I bring are in

themselves only *probable* ; that, as I said before, might have been debated. Some of the inferences from Scripture are less, and some from other places are more plain.

But to say, that ‘all that I pretend to from any or all of the ‘places is, that I see no necessary inference,’ (plain enough, I mean, to satisfy the conscience of any sincere inquirer of tolerable learning and capacity,) is an injurious perverting of my words ; especially when he backs and improves this falsehood by saying absolutely, in the following as well as foregoing parts of this chapter, that I ‘confess it cannot be proved from Scripture.’

He makes me, by saying so, say that in earnest which (as I shewed) the late Jesuits say out of a politic and wicked design to puzzle all protestants, and promote this schism. If the reader please to turn to part ii. chap. 8<sup>a</sup>, he will see that near the end of that chapter I do charge and prove this upon the papists, that they have of late taken upon them to say, that ‘infant-baptism cannot ‘be proved from Scripture, but only by the custom and tradition of ‘the church ;’ that the old books of the papists, till about eighty years ago, do constantly prove it by Scripture ; and what a weak thing it is in the antipædobaptists to be caught by this bait of our common enemies. And is it credible after all this, that I should maintain the same thing myself?

Now I have shewn sufficiently, that what he charges me with is a heinous thing ; and how contrary it is to the tenor of my book ; let us see what are his proofs on which he grounds this accusation. And the way of managing his evidence is such as must needs shame him as much as the foulness of the charge itself.

He first quotes to this purpose three pieces of sentences in the first page of my *preface*. Which page I desire the reader to peruse, and see the tenor of the whole sentence.

One is this. I am there making what excuses the matter would bear for the doubts of the unlearned men among the antipædobaptists ; and after some other things do say, ‘that the commission, ‘Matt. xxviii. 19, is set down in such brief words, that there is no ‘*particular* direction given, what they were to do in reference to ‘the children of those that received the faith.’

This he recites, p. 144, without any very material alteration of my words. But reciting them again, p. 146, he basely alters them ; and makes me say, ‘that there is *no where* any particular direction,’ &c., and adds some words to the end of my sentence ; those last indeed not very material. But the putting in the words *no where*,

<sup>a</sup> [See vol. i. pp. 563, 567.]



is a very gross forgery, and a very material alteration. For it is one thing to say, there is no particular direction concerning such or such a point of Christian practice in Matt. xxviii., and a very different thing to say, there is *no where* in Scripture any such direction. Let any one judge whether this man is to be trusted to quote the words of his antagonist, and then draw odious conclusions from them.

My own words are no more than any pædobaptist will say. They do not import that our Saviour in the command of baptizing *all nations* is not to be understood to mean *infants*, as well as *men* and *women*, (which I endeavour at other forecited places of my book to shew that he did,) only that they are not *particularly* there named, (for those are my words, ‘no *particular* direction,’) as indeed neither *men* nor *women* are; but only the aggregate word, *nations*.

Much less do they import that in *no other place* of Scripture there is proof that infants were, or ought to be baptized. There are many proofs of it, beside this commission; and which do help to explain the commission: the tenor of the whole Old Testament, that infants were (before our Saviour’s giving this commission) all along received into covenant with their parents, and were expressly ordered so to be, Deut. xxix: and those other places of Scripture which I just now mentioned as having been urged by myself: and that *the blessing* (or covenant) *of Abraham is come on the Gentiles*; which blessing or covenant of Abraham had plainly this advantage, to have the children entered into it: and many other places brought by those who purposely insist on Scripture proofs.

So far are those my words (that in Matt. xxviii. there is no *particular* direction about infants) from implying what he says, ‘I confess, that there is *no where* any proof from Scripture.’

My next words are, ‘And among all the persons recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant; nor is there on the other side any account of any Christian’s child, whose baptism was put off till he was grown up, or who was baptized at man’s age.’

Of this he recites one part, and very unfairly leaves out the other. For all the question now in our time being about the children of *Christians*, whether they are to be baptized in infancy, or afterwards; my words, as they stand, make the failure of proof from the instances of persons baptized by the apostles, equal on both sides as to any that were born of Christian parents, infant or adult; for the apostles lived to see many children of Christians thirty or forty years

old; and yet there is no *express* mention of their baptizing any such at their adult age (which, by the way, is a great sign they had been baptized before in their infancy). Mr. Emlyn might (if he had been as immodest as Mr. Gale) as well have charged me with ‘confessing that there is no proof from Scripture for baptizing those ‘who had Christian parents at all,’ as Mr. Gale can charge me with what he does here. He did not so; he only pretended to draw consequences of his own, that children of Christians need not be baptized at all: he did not say that ‘I confessed it.’ If Mr. Gale had done no worse than so, I might have blamed him for weak arguing, not for an unfair account of my words.

But suppose the first part of that saying of mine had stood without the latter part; could any modest man have taken it for a ‘cession that there is no Scripture proof,’ &c.? Among the few persons recorded expressly and by name, as baptized by the apostles, there is no mention of any infant: (as in the life written of any great bishop, archbishop Laud, &c., I do not think there is :) does it follow from thence that their baptizing of infants, or ordering it to be done, is not implied by circumstances, as the baptizing of households, &c.? *Express* mention (which is the word I use) were as much as to say in so many words, ‘they baptized such or such an infant;’ but there may be sufficient proof of a thing by circumstances without such express mention.

But, however, to say, ‘I confess there is no Scripture proof,’ is to say, ‘I confess there is no proof from those recorded examples of the apostles, nor from any other place of Scripture;’ which that I should ever say, is, I am sure, a very great falsehood. And there follows one worse yet.

In the same page, [p. 144,] (where I am still making excuses for the mistakes of such, who for want of learning or reading fall into doubts, (or, as I express it,) ‘contrary sentiments,’ concerning infant-baptism,) I say, that ‘the proofs drawn by consequences from ‘some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question, are not ‘so plain, as to hinder the arguments drawn from other places for ‘the other side, from seeming still considerable to those that have no ‘help from the history of the Scripture times, for the better understanding of the rules of Scripture.’

This wretched quoter recites one half of this sentence, (yet in that half leaving out those material words, ‘for any one side of this question,’) and then cuts it off at the word ‘considerable,’ where there is no stop, not so much as a comma; and leaves out, ‘to those

‘that have no help,’ &c., and presently adds, ‘all which is in short to grant, that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture.’

This is right Danvers, or worse than Danvers. For if I say, ‘the exceptions made by the antipædobaptists against the Scripture proofs for infant-baptism may seem considerable to ignorant and unlearned men;’ and another quoting my words shall take the liberty to leave out the last words, and conclude, that *I confess* or *grant* that there are no good Scripture proofs for it; all faith or credit to one man repeating the sayings of another is lost and destroyed. For it is a very different thing to say, an exception or argument is, or seems, considerable, meaning by its own real weight or force; and to say, it may seem considerable to *ignorant* men. When an ignorant man reads that our Saviour was baptized at thirty years of age; and many in heathen countries at their adult age; it may seem to him a considerable argument that infant-baptism was not then accounted lawful; for he thinks, if it were, why had not these men been baptized before in their infancy? But what are learned men appointed teachers for, but to do this office, among others; to make such an ignorant man understand the *history of those times*, that Christian baptism was then but newly instituted, or but newly brought into those countries; and therefore they could not have received it in their infancy?

Besides all this difference, to say, there are exceptions against a proof which do *seem considerable*, (which was my word,) is not presently to grant those proofs to be no proofs. Many texts of Scripture, and many other propositions, have objections against them that may *seem considerable*, and yet do remain *true*. So weakly does he argue, as well as falsely quote.

There is another saying of mine, which he, at his

Page 144, recites from near the end of my book. It is too long to copy out his words and mine at large. The reader may see them in his book. He falsifies the import of my words by perverting the sense of them, as much as in the other instances. I am there mentioning the advantages which the antipædobaptists do take in their public disputes before a *multitude* of vulgar people. ‘Having plain places of Scripture to produce concerning adult baptism, and several examples of it, they work much on such of the people as had not minded this before,’ &c., and in accounting for the mistake of the force of the argument from thence, do say, ‘that in a nation newly converted to Christianity, (and such are all the cases men-

‘tioned in the Scripture,) the adult people must be baptized first, ‘before their infants can be baptized.’ The improvement he makes from hence is,

‘Mr. Wall confesses, all the passages in Scripture relate to the ‘baptism of adult persons.’ Utterly false. I said, ‘they have plain ‘passages for adult baptism;’ he makes me say, ‘all the passages.’ I said that in such a state of a ‘nation newly converted, the adult ‘persons must be baptized first, before their infants.’ He represents me as ‘confessing that the Scripture gives no proof of the ‘baptizing their infants at all.’ The ignorant *multitude*, of which I there speak, are apt to think that we do by our principle deny *adult baptism* ever to have been used, or that it ever should be used; and consequently that every example in Scripture of adult baptism is an argument against *infant-baptism*. Whereas we do from those plain places and examples of Scripture urge the necessity of baptism to an *adult* person that has not been yet baptized, as much and more than they do, (for they will suffer a sick man, that cannot bear dipping, to die without it,) they would have the *multitude* to think those examples to make against us, when really they do not at all. Now then let any one judge whether that my saying, ‘there are plain ‘places of Scripture concerning adult baptism,’ be any better proof than the rest, of my ‘owning that there is no proof of Scripture for ‘the other.’

Having now recited all the evidence he brings against me for that vile accusation; I desire that I may have the justice allowed me, to charge him home with the falsehood of it. And because Colonel Danvers had a great name, and Mr. Baxter<sup>c</sup>, making a comparison between him and one Bagshaw, (who it seems was notorious for this faculty,) said, ‘Mr. Bagshaw is now quite overdone in the quality ‘of untruths;’ let us for this purpose compare some of the worst of Mr. Danvers’ untruths with this of the writer before us.

Mr. Danvers would falsely recite, or pervert the sense of some *old author*; so that by his management of a sentence, and making his own consequence from it, and then setting down that consequence as the author’s words, or what that author *confessed*, some old council or author would speak antipædobaptism<sup>d</sup>. But he never, that I remember, had the face to do this with a book that he was answering, or writing against. He would never say that Mr. Baxter, for example, said, confessed, or owned, what he did not

<sup>c</sup> [In his ‘Confutation of the strange ‘forgeries of Mr. Henry Danvers,’ &c.]

given at vol. i. p. 161, 204, 335, 336, 337, 359, 465, 475, 585.

<sup>d</sup> [See instances of this unfair dealing



say or confess. Good reason. For his readers were supposed to have Mr. Baxter's book to compare, whereas the old books they would hardly ever examine.

Another difference; that gentleman understood Latin but very indifferently, and might mistake the sense, which cannot be said of our author, whose talent is philology.

So that upon the whole I should think that Mr. Gale has won.

He thinks he exposes me to some contempt, when he relates how I asked pardon of one whom I conceived I might have wronged, (who it seems told him of it; so greedy have they been to pick up frivolous stories;) but I would advise him, if he have wronged any one to such a degree as he has me in this untrue accusation, to ask his pardon; or else to read and apply to himself what our Saviour says, Matt. v. 23-26. As for doing it to me, I shall excuse him by giving it beforehand; only for the vindication of the cause and myself, I would have the truth of the matter of fact fairly examined, and I do not care if it be done by those of his own opinion, who have any due regard to common justice.

This pretended concession of mine is the groundwork of all this chapter of his, and all the rest is a declamation and triumph upon the supposal that 'we have no Scripture proof to plead;' that 'the Scripture is wholly silent concerning infant-baptism;' and twenty other ways that he has of expressing it. And to give him his due, grant him that, and he can go on, and build consequences upon it, strenuously enough, and approve himself a very *wordy* author. But the foundation being taken from him, all the superstructure falls of itself. So that I have no more to do with this chapter, than to make a few remarks on here and there a passage.

Page 143. He says, the antipædobaptists 'have been taken for a very strange sort of people;' but now the world is persuaded they 'are not that unreasonable mischievous sect they were represented 'to be.'] But the good opinion that was had of their sincerity is something lessened again by his unfair way of defending their cause; so far, I mean, as one man's foul dealing can go, to reflect a discredit on the general body, which does not go very far; for I believe a great many of them do disapprove of his disingenuous representations of things. And where he in the same page wishes 'a more impartial and learned examination of these matters might be seriously entered on,' it must be then with some better regard to truth than he has shewn, lest it come (as Mr. Baxter complained it did in his days) to, 'Thou liest,' and 'Thou liest.'

Page 147. ‘They must not surmise, but *plainly* shew us that ‘infant-baptism is indeed contained in the Scriptures.’] Some writers, and particularly some of the antipædobaptists, do carry their demand of *plainness* in the Scriptures to such a degree of peremptoriness, as is inconsistent with that awe and reverence which is due to God’s word. We must take his word as it is, and not arrogantly demand why he did not cause such or such things to be expressed plainer, that there might have been left no possible room for cavils, doubts, or exceptions. Some things therein are so. But that some other things (even of those which God would have to be done) are not expressed with the same degree of plainness, but must be concluded by circumstances, &c., is confessed by all readers of it.

We must in such cases use humility and diligence in reading, weighing, comparing the several texts, and consequences from texts, or from the nature of the thing itself. And if from all these there be light enough to satisfy the conscience of an impartial inquirer, that such or such a thing is our Lord’s real meaning, we must do it without cavilling. If a master give a command to his servant in short, to take care of his flock, shall an arrogant servant excuse himself, that he did not in the commission *particularly* name the lambs?

Now what we say of the plainness of the proof from Scripture for dedicating and entering our infant children (as well as ourselves) into the covenant of God in Christ, (without which there is no salvation either to infants or adult,) and giving them baptism, the seal thereof, is this: that there is in God’s word so much proof of this being our duty, as may satisfy the conscience of such an inquirer as I spoke of, though not such as will stop the mouth of an importunate and undutiful caviller. If upon such weighing and consideration, the reasons from God’s word *for* the doing any thing do clearly overweigh those that may be brought *against* the doing it, our duty is to do it.

Page 148. ‘Which (baptism of adult persons) is a thing very ‘rarely seen or heard of now in the greatest part of the Christian ‘world, their traditionary pædobaptism being substituted in its ‘room.’] And should not such a matter of fact (setting aside his invidious epithets) startle the conscience even of a confident man, to see his opinion concerning the sense of God’s word condemned by *almost all* his brethren of the Christian world? *Almost all* in this age, and *quite all* in most former ages. Can they think that there were not, or are not, in any or all the national churches that are, or ever were, any that can judge of the meaning of God’s word? They

should mind how St. Paul speaks to some among the Corinthians, who were very self-conceited: 1 Cor. xi. 16. *If any be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God:* and again, ch. xiv. 36; *What? came the word of God out from you; or came it unto you only?*

Page 149. Our author at his ordination—declared upon oath his ‘free and full assent to the Articles.’ And again, p. 151, ‘All the clergy—their free assent upon oath.’] This happens to men that will talk confidently of things they understand not. The clergy do subscribe the Articles, but not at their ordination, nor upon oath. The exception that he here makes against mine, or their adhering to the doctrine of them, is too apparently frivolous (being founded on his foregoing untruth) to need any notice.

Page 153. He seems here to be writing for a *place*. I thought that some of them had gratified him for his pains, that he needed not to bring in any by-aims into a book of controversy. But how if that great man should read his second chapter, p. 53, &c., where he would understand himself to be (as Mr. Gale pronounces the verdict upon us all) ‘no true member of a Christian church; not baptized; one with whom it is not fit to have any communion,’ &c.

Page 155. Speaking of the subjects of baptism. ‘And those you have already seen, sir, Mr. Wall himself allows to be the adult only, as far as the Scriptures can go to inform us of the matter.’] This is one of the twenty—I spoke of. But tell me, Mr. Gale, did your *sir* give his nod to this too? I can hardly think it of him. If he did, it is like pleader, like judge.

This calumny (since he stands in it thus) and some of his others are of such moment, and are such direct falsehoods, that it may be needful for me to do as Mr. Wills did against Mr. Danvers, viz. to put in an *Appeal* against him to his own brethren. And I do in good earnest desire any of the antipædobaptists, who are lovers of truth, and do scorn to have their cause defended by base methods and untruths in matter of fact, to examine and give their opinion concerning this conduct of his. What I have to say to the body of them, any other reader may, if he pleases, pass over as a thing not concerning him.

I desire them to try, and judge, and declare, whether he has not done an open injury to me and the truth, and indeed to the credit of their cause, by this falsehood of which I have been speaking, and

<sup>e</sup> [One of Mr. Wills’ publications on the baptismal controversy is entitled, ‘An Appeal to the Baptists against Mr.

‘Danvers for his strange forgeries.’ See the note at p. 304 of vol. i.]

(because I would not incumber them with an inquiry into *all* his misrepresentations) by two more.

What he affirms positively, over and over, through this chapter, (that I do confess, or own, or allow, or grant, that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture,) I charge upon him as a falsehood. Let the places of my book which he quotes, or any other that he can find to prove this my *concession*, (as he calls it,) be considered and canvassed. Please to observe, gentlemen, that the verdict or judgment to be given in this case is not, whether there be, or be not, in your opinion, proof from Scripture for it: but whether I have said or granted that there is none. And if I have not, you see where the falsehood rests.

Of the other two things, one is, where he says, ‘that I do ‘industriously take all occasions to blacken the antipædobaptists, ‘and render them the objects of resentment and contempt;’ and a great many other odious charges to the same purpose, (his way being, as I said, where a thing is untrue, to repeat it over and over.) These are to be seen in his 13, 14, and 15 pages. And again at p. 30, where he refers to a page of mine, which page, if any one read, I desire them to mind whether I say any thing of *countenancing*; and whether I do not say, ‘there are but few of them ‘in England that hold that error.’ And again at p. 32, where he speaks of me as ‘representing and judging of the whole body by the ‘odd, singular opinions of a few particular men in it;’ which I did not do. And again at p. 35, that ‘I load them with some of the ‘most infamous and hated opinions,’ and instances in that of the Socinians, and says, ‘I insinuate as if they countenanced’ such; whereas I neither say nor insinuate any such thing, but do say the direct contrary, (and he had seen it, and quotes part of it,) that ‘they that profess it openly are rejected from their communion.’ I begin that paragraph thus: ‘Socinians they have some that creep ‘in among them;’ and end it as he says: and had, in my second edition, p. 449, mentioned a decree or resolution of their general body for that purpose<sup>f</sup>.

If any antipædobaptist will mind what expressions I use, when I speak of the general body of them, (as in those places of the second part of my book, which in the first edition are p. 216. 279, 280. 288. 402, 403, 404. 416; in the second edition they are p. 430.—453, 454. 460. 549, 550, 551. 554. 561<sup>g</sup>.) he will see how falsely

<sup>f</sup> [This is found at vol. i. p. 555 of the present edition.]

occur at pages 533, 560, 568, 674, 669, 680, 688. of volume i.]

<sup>g</sup> [In the *present* edition these passages



Mr. Gale represents the character that I give of them. And in reading that second edition every body will observe that what I could learn concerning their several tenets, by discourse with Mr. Stennet, (who gave me better information than I could get elsewhere,) I have carefully and candidly inserted it.

For when my second edition was in the press, a good while before that chapter concerning the *present state and tenets* of the English antipædobaptists was printed off, I wrote to him, being then unknown to me by face, to this purpose; that however different our opinions were concerning what ought to be held or practised, yet that in an *historical* account of what they *do actually* hold or practise, I was desirous to be informed by themselves; and accordingly desired him to read that chapter, and give me his observations on it. But before he could well answer, I having occasion to go to London, called on him. He received me very kindly; acknowledged that I had treated the antipædobaptists more civilly than had been usual; said that he had not yet written any thing of what I had desired, but that if I would take pen and ink, he would, as he read the several paragraphs, tell me what he thought might be added or altered, which I might set down in short notes. I did so. He did not pretend, as this man does, that I had said any thing false of their tenets, but in many places where I had said that ‘some of them’ hold so and so, he told me, ‘there were but few, and those of least repute, that held so.’ I inserted in the several paragraphs the notes I had taken from his mouth, as may be seen in the second edition. As at p. 432. [vol. i. p. 535.] ‘And I have ‘received of late a credible account,’ &c.—p. 435. [539.] ‘I am ‘told by one that should know,’ &c.—What I say, p. 436. [540.] ‘I think it is but few in *England*,’ &c., stands as it did. He made no exception or addition to that, p. 445. [551.] ‘I am lately assured ‘by a man of chief note,’ &c., p. 447. [554.] ‘But this account of ‘Danvers,’ &c.—and another like note at the foot of page 553. P. 451, 452, [558, &c.] there is a more exact account of the office of *teachers, messengers, representatives*, than I had had before. And what he could tell me, that tended to the clearing of Hicks, I added as a P. S. p. 431. [534.]

Now what I desire in justice is, that such foul words as Mr. Gale uses against me on this point, (as where he says, p. 35, ‘If indeed ‘the things he taxes us with were true,’ &c., ‘but they are so notoriously false, that I admire any man, especially one of Mr. Wall’s ‘order,’ &c.) may be examined; and he required to shew the falsehood, or else to take the guilt and shame and imputation of it to

himself. And that to that purpose, what I have said above, in answer to his first and second chapters, viz. to his 13, 14, 15, and 30, 31, and 35, 36 pages, may be considered. And that they try whether they can fairly bring off this defender of their cause from the imputation of using base means to do it; and if not, consider how far they will approve of him.

I suppose he spread this character of me, on purpose to keep the antipædobaptists from giving any impartial regard to what I said, or produced from antiquity; (for no man hears willingly one that hates and belies him;) but I hope they will search carefully where the lie is to be fixed.

The other is, that which I mentioned above in my answer to his long discourse from p. 50 to p. 54, where he represents the sense of my words in a manner so gross and absurd, as to make it as bad as his other way of falsifying words.

In my ‘Dissuasive from Separation,’ part ii. chap. 11, I have argued, that Christians, whose opinions do not differ in *fundamentals*, ought not for other differences to separate or renounce communion with one another (owning at the same time that they that differ in *fundamentals* must separate). I gave there several reasons why the difference between pædobaptists and antipædobaptists should not be accounted a fundamental one. From the Scripture. From the Creeds. From the case of Tertullian, and Gregory Nazianzen. From the declared sense of many of the most noted men both of the one and the other side of this question, particularly of Mr. Tombes, Mr. Stennet, and of those one hundred churches of antipædobaptists whose *confession* is published 1699, and another 1701. With these I there argue, that they ought, by their principle, to hold communion with the church of the place where they live, in prayers and in the other sacrament, even on supposition *that their opinion be right*, that giving baptism to the adult only is the fittest, and though they continue in that practice themselves. My reason is, because the difference is confessed by them not to be *fundamental*. And this wretched perverter of my words, declaring himself for the other *uncharitable* opinion, says, ‘We (meaning himself, and ‘I know not who else) do hold it to be fundamental; and that none ‘but persons dipped at their adult age are true members of the ‘Christian church; and that none else are baptized.’ And ‘Mr. ‘Wall supposes us in the right in all this; and yet would have us ‘unite with persons we are persuaded are not baptized,’ p. 53: and p. 52, says of me, that I always, ‘proceed on this supposition.’ I had indeed said that there were some few such uncharitable men among

them, who say (much as the *Donatists* did, and *Papists* do) that none are Christians but themselves. But any one that reads the place will see, that it is with the other (the main body of them) that I there argue, that they ought (even supposing their way of baptism be in itself better) to join with the church in other duties.

Let the men, to whose honesty I appeal, judge if this be not a base abuse of my words. The other slander he repeated about twenty times: this I think about ten. Let them say whether such tricking imposture be to be used in arguments for religious matters.

Worse than this. He at p. 52 calls it my *concession*. I never made a concession that the other, the charitable sort, are in the right in their opinion; but only a supposition or putting the case that they were so.

All this while, though he pretend to answer that chapter of mine, he takes not a word of notice of what I there produce from the *confession* of the one hundred churches, and from Mr. Tombes and Mr. Stennet, declaring the contrary to what he here declares to be the sense of the antipædobaptists. I believe indeed he does not like them. But I wonder that saying of Mr. Stennet, ‘the reproach which Mr. Russen casts on them, (the antipædobaptists,) viz. that ‘they judge none of the true church but those of their own way,’ did not fly in his face and daunt him, while he was setting me forth as a *reproacher* of them; for by Mr. Stennet’s account it is he, and not I, that casts a reproach upon them. I shall never forget what Mr. Stennet told me, (which I recite, second edition, p. 447,) vol. i. [p. 554,] that ‘the country where I live is full of such of them as ‘are of the least repute.’ For I see that the antipædobaptists in many other parts of England do speak and argue much more like Christians than this man.

These three instances of his conduct I do lay before the antipædobaptists, for their approbation or disapproving; and I think it concerns the credit of their cause, and the reputation of their sincerity, to declare one or the other of them.

And when their hands are in, and his book is before them, it will, I know, be much expected of them to declare their sentiment concerning Mr. Gale’s notion of *dipping*, whether a thing or person be *dipped*, if a small part of it (as the nib of a pen) be dipped, or covered with water. A fair stating of this, and their free declaring their opinion, may go a great way toward adjusting and ending many contentious disputes. The pages where he treats of this, p. 76, &c., I noted above. In favour to that notion of his, I would give my humble advice, that they take this consideration along with

them; that without the help of it, they will never be able to maintain that the word *baptize* does always signify *to dip*.

Page 156. ‘And our author himself has recourse to it so frequently.’] I thought I might have done with that grating complaint; but here is another necessary occasion given, another thing said of me, that is utterly false. For he is here speaking of some who use ‘a miserable cavil, that Christ has nowhere forbidden them to baptize infants, and therefore they infer they ought not to neglect it.’ He spends four or five pages in a trifling manner to expose this cavil, and exemplifies it by comparisons: ‘Why does not our author baptize persons after they are dead——since the Scripture does not expressly forbid him?’ ‘The Scripture does not say to the contrary, but that such a clod in a field is Adam’s body:’ nor ‘that the Roman is not the only true catholic church;’ and such rambling impertinences. But at p. 158 he says he will ‘give an instance something nearer to the matter in hand. We are nowhere forbid to baptize our cattle, bells, tables,’ &c.

But I will give an instance nearer yet. We are forbid to——. For this (as said of me, that I ‘have frequent recourse to this argument’) is no other. I had argued in my *introduction* to this purpose: that there having been before Christ’s and St. John’s time a custom to baptize infants, we must not say that they altered any thing, or that Christ bade his apostles alter any thing from the usual way, unless we had proof from Scripture that they did so. And where Christ uses general words, *all nations, every person*, we must not make exceptions unless the Scripture do. And I produced Dr. Lightfoot’s words to that purpose. But this is nothing like the *cavil* that Mr. Gale speaks of, but has a direct contrary tendency. Yet he, without any regard to truth, imputes it to me; and goes on with aggravating the absurdity of this cavil, (which he feigns me to use,) till at last he has heated himself to that degree of foul language as to say, at

Page 158, ‘If our author argues well, and the Scripture’s silence be sufficient reason for a thing, he ought in honour and conscience to return to *Rome*.’]

Most young men that are brought up to learning, are at the same time taught and inured to rules of civility, good manners, and to forbearing of scurrilous language. I wonder how Mr. Gale has attained the one of these, (for he has indeed a good faculty of philological learning,) and yet seems never to have been taught any thing of the other. Some of the country clownish disputants, when



they are got on some heath or common, one into one waggon, and the other into another, to brawl against one another before a rabble, are apt, after some provoking language, to say, 'Get you gone to Munster, from whence you came all of you;' and the other to answer, 'Do you return to Rome.' But in a printed book of a learned man, I have seldom seen such stuff before, as in this and in the next paragraph, 'Our author ought to follow his example,' &c. Especially if the occasion was not real, but feigned, as it is here, and no provocation given. As to any given by me, I was so unfortunate as never to have heard of Mr. Gale before he wrote; and for the antipædobaptists in general, I am confident (and will refer it to any impartial reader) that what Mr. Stennet observed is true, that no book written in this dispute has been freer from any provoking or abusive expressions. But he has in this very chapter forged out of his own brain several things to fix upon me, and then pursues the consequences of those forgeries with reproaches, such as are never used (at least without a preceding provocation) but by very ill-bred men. But why does he repeat this but three or four times? For it is as false as any of the rest.

I will not hastily believe of the antipædobaptists, many of whom (I have once said it<sup>h</sup>, and will not yet go from it) are 'a sober and grave, quiet and peaceable sort of men,' therefore I will not believe of them, that they, perceiving that the history which I wrote of infant-baptism did, by all the testimonies which are to be found of the ancient Christians, shew their practice and doctrine to be *for* it; and that the summing up of the evidence did turn (whether I would or not) *against* their tenet; and that they were not able to bring any candid writer that could fairly contradict or overthrow the credit of the testimonies produced, did therefore contrive to set up against me one of their fierce creatures to bait me. I rather think they were mistaken in their man. For they might easily judge, that the satisfying the conscience of a doubting Christian (which is all that controversial books are good for) does not depend upon declamation and harangue, or an assured and masterlike way of talking, much less upon picking up stories, and making personal reflections on the writer, and less yet upon forgeries, taunts, and foul-mouthed reproaches. Any history (and mine was nothing else) can be answered no other way, but by shewing the evidence of the facts or sayings to be either not true, or not pertinent; which has

<sup>h</sup> [See vol. i. p. 533.]

been the least part of this author's aim. He has not pretended or attempted to answer in that way any more than the first five chapters, not one tenth of the whole evidence; and we shall see, when we come at it, how that is done.

---

## CHAP. VII.

WHEN I read over the first ten pages of this chapter, I was under some difficulty in what method one must begin an answer to so long and rambling an argument, the force of which does all depend upon something which, at page 162, he says he will discover by and by. But when I came to p. 166, I was eased. For there he says of all before, 'But these are trifles. A more material objection 'is yet behind.' I thought he never spoke a truer word, and should have been content to let them pass as such.

But they are indeed worse than *trifles*. For he cannot forbear to bring in by head and shoulders a malicious accusation against king Charles I, at page 161, that 'all people thought——he gave 'private instructions to his fleet sent to Rochelle, that they should 'not assist the town.' And another false one against me, at page 165, (which I think may be the fortieth or fiftieth of that nature,) that I do 'insinuate more than once, that the commission, 'Matt. xxviii. 19, relates *peculiarly*' (that is, as he presently after explains his meaning, *only*) 'to the adult.' His confidence at some times is not strong enough to affirm that I *say* such or such a thing, (which I wonder at,) and then he says that I *insinuate* it.

His evidence against the blessed martyr is one Leti; who, I suppose, knew nothing of the matter, but only echoed what the rebellious party then in England said; and yet at last does not say near what Mr. Gale does. And against me he quotes my book, part ii. p. 378, 379, (in the last edition it is p. 531<sup>i</sup>), which whosoever reads over, be he pædobaptist or antipædobaptist, and does not see that I am so far from saying or *insinuating* what he says, that I endeavour to prove the direct contrary, (viz. that infants are meant as part of the *nations*,) that man and I shall never agree about the sense of plain words.

His boasting of his performance, which is not omitted in any chapter, takes up a good part of this. He begins it 'I hope, sir, 'I may venture to say that what was urged in my last' (that was where he urged from the *concession* which he had forged in my name

<sup>i</sup> [In the present edition, p. 651, 655, vol. i.]

of the Scripture's silence) 'amounts to little less than a demonstration.' It does not *quite*, it seems, amount to a *demonstration*. But I can tell him what it amounts to quite. And at p. 161, 'the steps that I take are easy and sure, according to the method in use among mathematicians——: and therefore I may well enough call it a demonstration.' It were really advisable for him to study something of the mathematics, for he could never then allow himself to argue so loosely as he does. The demonstration (all of it that is pertinent) comes at

Pages 163, 164, &c. The words of the commission, *Teach* (so he translates the word *μαθητεύσατε*) *all nations, baptizing them*, &c., 'are *equally* said of all——without difference or exception. From whence it follows, that the same things are to be done to all, and that too in the same order.' Then he infers to this purpose: But the adult must be taught *first*, before they be baptized: therefore infants must either be taught *first*, (which is impossible,) or else not baptized. This is the substance, for it is impossible to bring his demonstration into a syllogism.

And it is just as strong as this other would be: The commission, *baptizing them in the name*, &c., *teaching them to observe*, &c., runs in the counter-order; and therefore demonstrates the direct contrary. Nay not so strong. For here the word *διδάσκοντες* does certainly signify *teaching*, and nothing else.

As strong as this: That command, Exod. xii, *Let all his males be circumcised*, is given for all males in the same words: therefore if the adult males must be taught the meaning of that seal of God's covenant before they receive it, so must the infant males also, or else not be circumcised.

Page 166. To shew that all persons in the nations are not meant, he instances in unbelievers, blasphemers, atheists, debauchees, &c. Now these are that sort of persons whom our Saviour came especially to call, and sent his apostles to convert and baptize them. It is true, that if they would not be converted, they must not be baptized. The reason is, that they themselves did in such a case put a bar, which is not the case of infants.

Page 167, he gives as great an instance of pride and insolence, as one shall almost ever see in any haughty ill-bred young man. He attacks Mr. Dorrington, a grave divine, in a most contemptuous manner, for no other reason but his publishing a book to prove infant-baptism from Scripture, and particularly from this text, Matt. xxviii. 19; calling him 'an author that affects wonders, and 'his whole book is one, in which he undertakes to prove infant-

‘baptism from Scripture.’ And he concludes, ‘If the rector of Wittresham had better considered,———he would not have exposed himself so much by the publication of this book.’

Has he in the midst of his haughtiness forgot who he himself is, and that a rector of Wittresham (which term he, according to the custom of ill-bred men in these times, uses in contempt) is a much better title than any he can pretend to? Or does he think things are come to that pass, that the schismatics shall publish what they please against the doctrines of the church, and it shall not be allowed to the ministers thereof to write the defence of them from Scripture, without being publicly insulted for so doing? Sure that is no part of the indulgence intended to dissenters by the present toleration. It was so perhaps in Oliver Cromwell’s time.

If he do not know that all others (as well as Mr. Dorrington) have been used to prove infant-baptism from Scripture, why have the antipædobaptists set up one to write, that has read nothing of what has been said before on the subject? Has not Mr. Baxter, for one, a large book, ‘Plain Scripture Proof for Infants’ Church-membership and Baptism?’ Colonel Danvers speaks, and I from him, of a papist, who, going to hear a dispute about infant-baptism, told his friend he was ‘going to hear a miracle, viz. infant-baptism ‘proved by Scripture<sup>k</sup>.’ This has been counted an instance of a shameless papist mocking the protestants. But we see he is imitated.

He abuses Mr. Dorrington and me, both in that one paragraph; either of us, I suppose, old enough to be his father: him for undertaking to prove it from Scripture, and me by repeating again the forementioned vile slander, that I own, &c.

At p. 168 begins the long dispute of above sixty pages, about the signification of the word *μαθητεύσατε*, Matt. xxviii. 19: whereas, to the argument for infant-baptism taken from that text, (which is in the English, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.*) viz. that infants are part of the nation, and so to be baptized by this commission, the antipædobaptists do retort, and say, infants are such a part of the nation, as are not capable of being *taught*, and so not to be baptized; I had answered in half a page, that the word which is translated *teach*, in the first of those clauses, has a peculiar signification in the original, and is not the same word as that which is translated *teach* in the second, but signifies much like what we say in English; ‘to enter any one’s name ‘as a scholar, disciple, or proselyte to such a master, school, or pro-

<sup>k</sup> [See vol. i. p. 566.]



'fession.' And that the Jews' language, as it does not admit of this phrase, 'an infant is taught, or instructed,' so it very well allows of this other, such or such an infant is 'entered a disciple,' or 'made a proselyte' to such a profession or religion. And I instanced in those children of proselytes, which when they were together with their parents circumcised and baptized, the Jews did commonly (as I had shewed) call *young proselytes*. And I added some other things in confirmation of that answer.

To overthrow this interpretation of mine given of that text, and of the word *μαθητεύσατε*, he (who through all the last chapter had boldly maintained that I pretended no Scripture proof at all) spends the most of this and the next chapter, producing a number of quotations, in some of which that word is used in the case of present actual teaching.

I would (as before for the word *βαπτίζω*) have granted him that ; that the word, *making disciples*, is far oftener used by authors in the case of such as are at that time actually begun to be taught. But the import of the word does not necessarily include that in its signification, and so need not be supposed to do it here.

I do not think fit to follow him in his long ramble through every paragraph and quotation, but shall here make such observations as I think necessary, and such as will, I think, take off the force of all that he in these two chapters brings against our sense of the word.

The word in its neuter intransitive signification (to *be* a disciple to, or under any one) had been used by others, viz. philosophers, historians, &c., before our Saviour's and St. Matthew's time ; but I think St. Matthew (or rather his interpreter) is the first that ever used it in the active transitive signification, (to *make* any one a disciple, or to *teach* one as a disciple,) or with any accusative case. There is no instance of this transitive signification in any of the passages of the heathen authors produced by Mr. Gale, nor, I think, in any other<sup>1</sup>. The Christian authors that use it so have borrowed it from St. Matthew, of which the earliest is St. Luke, Acts xiv. 21, (which is the only instance beside St. Matthew that I remember in the Bible.) The Fathers continue the use of it from them.

So that it seems to have been a new word, made on purpose to express the sense of the command given by our Saviour to his apostles, of proselyting all the nations of the world to him and his religion. The sense of it therefore must be learned from the notion of the word *μαθητῆς*, from whence it is immediately derived.

<sup>1</sup> [The lexicographers at least are acquainted with none such. See the latest and fullest, namely, Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, enlarged by Valpy, &c.]

1. Μαθητὴς is a *disciple*. And that μαθητεύω does accordingly' when it is used as a verb active, literally and in its immediate import, signify *to make disciples*; and when used as a verb neuter, *to be a disciple*, and μαθητεύομαι, *to be made a disciple*, is so plain a thing, that I will never spend time to prove it, unless I were to teach any one the grammar and analogy of that language. All that know them will, if they be not strongly biassed for a side, presently own it, and they that do not must take time to learn them. Even those that translate it *teach*, have done it only for this reason, because they obviously conceiving that the making men disciples is ordinarily done by teaching, have thought that to be the more intelligible word to stand in a vulgar translation. Mr. Le Clerc, who pretends to no small skill in these niceties, has (as Mr. Gale here quotes him, p. 189) owned this; that 'the proper signification of the word μαθητεύειν is, *to make disciples*, and not *to teach*;' though he do there add, 'it is true that disciples are not made but *by teaching*.' And Episcopius (whom he quotes afterward, p. 197) speaks to the same purpose. And so does Limborch. Nor is it contradicted by any that he quotes, (as far as I remember,) when they speak of the proper and grammatical rendering of the *word*; though the *thing* itself which they suppose our Saviour meant to command the apostles to do, they do many of them express by the words *teaching, instructing, &c.*; but many do keep to the word itself, *make disciples, gather disciples, &c.* And the criticism is not, as Mr. Gale, p. 186, expounds it, that the word 'primarily and immediately signifies *teaching*,' and consequentially *making disciples*, but the direct contrary: the immediate signification is *making disciples*, and consequentially *teaching*, viz. in all cases where disciples cannot be made but by present teaching, of which more must be said by and by. It is indeed true, what he there urges, that in the nature of the *things* 'teaching is in most cases the cause, and being made disciples the effect;' but in the grammatical import of the words, μαθητεύω primarily signifies *making, μαθητὰς, disciples*, and *teaching* no otherwise but by a consequence backward from the effect to the cause.

2. Since the direct and strict translation of the word in the commission is *making disciples*, it is proper to examine what is the import of that word *disciples*.

1. First, the etymology of it is, we know, from μαρθάνω, *to learn*, as a man learns an art, a trade, a doctrine, or a language. And I think Dr. Whitby, (as Mr. Gale quotes him here, p. 170,) saying, 'I desire any one to tell me how the apostles could μαθητεύειν, make

‘ a disciple of an heathen, or unbelieving Jew, without being μαθηταί  
 ‘ or teachers of them,’ has forgot himself; μαθητῆς never signifying  
 a teacher, but a learner. And the apostles were not to be μαθηταί of  
 the heathens, but the heathens of them. Else our Saviour’s com-  
 mand to the apostles would run; *make all nations μαθητὰς*, i. e. your  
 teachers.

But for a true conception of the import of the word *disciples*; a  
 thing much more considerable than the etymology is to observe the  
 use of it in the books of the New Testament, in what sense it is  
 generally taken there. And by a diligent minding the several  
 places where it occurs, it will appear to be used by them in much  
 the same sense as the word *Christians* is with us. In Acts ix. 26,  
 St. Paul, soon after he turned Christian himself, *assayed to join him-  
 self to the disciples at Jerusalem, but they were afraid of him, and  
 believed not that he was a disciple*: and at Ephesus he finding certain  
*disciples*, &c.: in all which places we should have said *Christian*, or  
*Christians*. And what puts it out of doubt that they used these  
 words as synonymous, is that St. Luke tells us, that those who had  
 been hitherto called *disciples* began at Antioch to be called *Christi-  
 ans*, Acts xi. 26, *The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch*.

In the books of Scripture, even after this, the writers do seldom  
 use the word *Christians*. St. Peter, who lived and preached at  
 Antioch, where the word was first framed, uses it once; *If any man  
 suffer as a Christian*. And king Agrippa was almost persuaded to  
 be a *Christian*. But our Saviour himself was the first author of the  
 word in effect. Those who were afterwards called *Christians*, he  
 styled Χριστοῦ ὄντας, *belonging to Christ*. And (what is remarkable  
 to this purpose) he uses it as equivalent to the word *disciples*. For  
 that which St. Matthew expresses thus, chap. x. 42, *Whosoever shall  
 give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only εἰς  
 ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, in the name of a disciple*, or because they are *disciples*;  
 St. Mark, ix. 41, has thus, *Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to  
 drink ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, in my name, because you  
 belong to Christ*, or because you are *Christ’s*, or *Christians*. And  
 St. Paul, who never, as I remember, uses either the word μαθητῆς or  
 the word Χριστιανός, does frequently use the word Χριστοῦ ὦν (which  
 had been used by our Saviour) instead of them, for any one’s being  
 a Christian. 2 Cor. x. 7, *If any man trust to himself Χριστοῦ εἶναι,  
 that he is Christ’s, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is  
 Χριστοῦ, Christ’s, even so are we Χριστοῦ, Christ’s*; where without  
 any deviation from the sense it might have been translated *Christi-  
 an*; we are *Christians* as well as he: and the like, Gal. v. 24, οἱ τοῦ



Χριστοῦ, *they that are Christ's, or Christians*; so Gal. iii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 23. Another word commonly used by him to the same purpose is ἅγιοι, *the saints*. Almost all his epistles are so directed; τοῖς ἁγίοις, 'to the saints' at such or such a place, i. e. the Christians there. He chides the Corinthians that they went to law before the unbelievers, and not before *the saints*, the Christians. He made a collection for the poor *saints* at Jerusalem, i. e. the Christian poor of that place. And this last word is used also by St. Jude, and often in the Revelation. Other words of like use, and to the same purpose, as μαθηταί, *the disciples*, in the New Testament, are οἱ ἀδελφοί, *the brethren*, οἱ τῆς ὁδοῦ, or ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ, *those of that way*, Acts ix. 2. item xxii. 4, that is, of the *Christian* way or religion.

These names compared together do give us somewhat a clearer notion of the import of the word *disciples*. They do all terminate in the Antiochian word, (which is now the common word to express them all,) viz. *Christians*. And consequently we do hereby understand more distinctly the sense of μαθητεύειν, (or as it is John iv. 1, μαθητὰς ποιῆν,) *to make disciples*. Whatever constitutes or makes a person τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι, to belong to Christ, to be a *Christian*, or in St. Paul's word, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Christ's, ἀδελφὸν, a brother, ἅγιον, a *saint*; that makes or constitutes him μαθητὴν, a *disciple*, in the Scripture sense of the word. And that does the blessed Spirit of God by the office of an apostle or other minister of Christ entering, dedicating, and baptizing him with water in the name which is by Christ appointed; by his own consent and faith, if he be adult; or by the consent and desire of his parents, or other guardians, or owners, dedicating him to Christ, if an infant. So that μαθητεύειν, *to disciple* any one, is equivalent to our English word, *christen* any one.

I think that the antipædobaptists themselves will grant that most of the other words which are equivalent to that of *disciple* may be applied to infants. They will not deny that infants may *belong to Christ*, or be τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *Christ's*. How else, if they die in infancy, can they come to the kingdom of heaven, which is not given to men or infants, merely as being of human race, but as belonging to Christ?

The term of *saints* (or *holy*, which is all one) St. Paul gives to children as well as to men, 1 Cor. vii. 14. And whoever grants them these titles, of being *Christ's*, or *Christians*, of being to be *received in his name*, and of being *saints*, or *holy*, will not deny them the name of *brethren*, or the other names which I mentioned, as equivalent to *disciples*.



3. Whereas Mr. Gale represents (as he does many times in these two chapters) the pædobaptists as denying that the word μαθητεύω does include, or connote, or has any relation to, *teaching*, he imputes to them more than, for ought I know, they ever said. At p. 171, having spoken of his antagonists, (for he has a scheme in his head, in which he is a considerable man, and the Catholic church are his antagonists,) he says, ‘Where is their ingenuity, who so irregularly, &c., arbitrarily pretend that these words have no relation to teaching?’ He says it positively of me, p. 190, that I ‘infer, since the word which signifies *to make disciples* does not necessarily include ‘teaching,’ &c. But this is no news with him to say of me, that I say or infer things that I never said or thought.

I do think and own that it does connote, or has a relation to, teaching, or being taught. For as μαθητής, *discipulus*, and the English word *disciple*, are derivatives of μαθηάω and *disco, to learn*, so (what one of his authors observes) *learning* and *teaching* are, I own, correlatives. He says, p. 168, that if it do not include teaching, all his ‘argument from this place unavoidably falls to the ground.’ So that I think we must, if it be but for pity’s sake, allow him that; that it has a reference to teaching.

What we pretend to is, that it does not necessarily follow from the signification of the word, that that *learning* or *teaching* must be at that present time, when one is made, or styled μαθητής, or μαθητευθείς. But sometimes it refers to that teaching which one *has had* a good while before, and sometimes to that teaching which one is entered, consigned, and covenanted to *have hereafter*.

1. That Mnason, mentioned Acts xxi. 16, is styled *a disciple* still, though he may be judged to *have learned* all that was necessary long before. And so is St. John himself, at a time when all the world had need to learn of him, viz. in his old age, when he was the only surviving apostle, and after he had written his Gospel. John xxi. 24, *This is the disciple who wrote these things*, &c. It would not be proper here to say, *the learner*. And in many of the quotations brought by Mr. Gale, the word is used for such as were not *then* learners, but *had learned*; as Aristotle, p. 194, and several others, p. 195, 196, &c.

2. Of the word μαθητής, applied to such as had not yet begun to learn, but were appointed, dedicated, consigned, or bound to learn, the examples in books cannot be so frequent, because it is a case that writers, holy or profane, have seldom occasion to speak of. I did in those few lines mention some. As that the Scripture does include the children of Christians in the notion of the word μαθηταί,

*disciples*, in those words of St. Peter, Acts xv. 10, where he says of them that would have imposed circumcision on the *Gentile* Christians, that they thereby attempted to put a yoke on the neck of the *disciples*; whereas it was the *infants* of those Christians especially, on whom the weight of this yoke would have fallen. Mr. Gale, p. 190, makes an exception against this instance, in which I am pleased to see how little he has to say against it, and shall answer it when I come to it.

I mentioned likewise the custom of the Jews to call the infant children of a proselyte, who were circumcised and baptized together with their father, *young proselytes*, (which, as I shewed, is the same thing as to say, *young disciples*,) at a time when as yet they could not *learn* or know any thing; only they were then dedicated to learn and keep the covenant of the true God when they grew up. And I produced the testimonies of the Jews themselves, and of their Misnah for proof of this custom.

I quoted also Justin Martyr using the very same word that St. Matthew does, ἐμαθητεύθησαν, and applying it to children, speaking of some old men of his time, who ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ‘were made disciples to Christ in (or from) their childhood.’

A very learned man has been pleased since to communicate to me some observations of his, which prove that the penmen of Scripture and other Christian authors have commonly used the word to signify the reception of any one to the degree and number of *disciples*, as preparatory to subsequent instruction: so as that the person so received in order to be taught was, before the instruction itself, styled *a disciple*.

As where Eusebius, discoursing of our Lord’s authority as a teacher, says, ‘A teacher professes himself skilful in some art or science; and his disciples being desirous to learn, submit themselves to his instructions:’ “Ὅτε γὰρ διδάσκων ἐπαγγελίαν μαθήματος τινος ἐπαγγέλλεται οὔτε αὐ μαθηταὶ, μαθημάτων ὀρεγόμενοι, σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῷ διδασκάλῳ προσφέροντες ἐπιτρέπουσιν, *Evangel. Demonstr.* lib. iii. § 5. He styles them *disciples* before they have yet begun to learn.

And concerning that man spoken of, Luke ix. 57, *It came to pass, as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest*; the same learned person observes that St. Matthew calls this man, and another, who offered himself at the same time, *disciples*. For he, chap. viii. 19, 20, 21, having recited the same that St. Luke does concerning the first man,

subjoins immediately, *Another of his disciples* (ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ) *said unto him, Lord, suffer me first &c.* The latter is expressly styled *a disciple* by St. Matthew, who calling him *another disciple*, does implicitly call the former likewise *a disciple*. Though it seems to have been the first meeting that the first had with our Saviour; and neither of them seem to have gone (at least not as yet) any farther than to express a purpose of following him.

We have the more reason to observe how St. Matthew, of all the evangelists, or his interpreter, uses the word μαθητῆς, because he being the first that ever formed from it the verb μαθητεύω in any active transitive signification, the import of that verb, *to make disciples*, is best learned from his notion of the word *disciple*. And we see he uses it for one that was designed, or had a purpose to follow Christ and learn of him, though he had not yet done it, and, as most ancient expositors think, never did.

He shews likewise by several instances, that in other words of a like use it is a necessary way of speaking in all languages, to give the term of some *office* or *action* to one who is now entered, appointed, or obliged to it, even before he actually performs any thing of it. A man becomes his *servant* whom he undertakes to serve, before he has performed any act of service. Nay, an infant may be born *a slave*, or servant, by a preceding obligation of his parents. A *pupil*, entered as such, under a *tutor*, has the name, before he has yet heard any lecture. And he gives a very apposite instance of such an use of words in the Scripture, in the case of the Kohathites, spoken of Numb. iii. There were but eight thousand six hundred of them in all, from a month old and upward, and all of that number are called, ver. 28, *keepers of the charge of the sanctuary*; for so are the words, *In the number of all the males, from a month old and upward, were eight thousand six hundred, keeping the charge of the sanctuary*. Those infants, as well as their fathers, are styled *keepers of the charge*, because they were dedicated and appointed to be brought up to that office; as an infant baptized in Christ's name is to his religion, being ἀπογεγραμμένος τῷ Χριστῷ, enrolled and listed under his banner, and a promise made for him that he shall be taught and educated in his doctrine.

And accordingly the Christians of all ages, ancient and modern, (the ancient without exception, the modern with the exception only of some presbyterians,) have and do express this stipulation at the baptizing of any infant, that he shall, if he live, be brought up to the learning of it.

There is a word in our own language, and in common use with us,



of the very same signification and derivation as μαθητής, or *disciple*; each of the words denotes a *learner*, only one refers to secular, the other to spiritual things to be learned. A father, or guardian, or sometimes a parish, puts out a child an *apprentice* to a master of any trade; he is called, and is an *apprentice* from the time of his being bound, (which may be, and sometimes is, in very tender years,) though he does not yet begin to learn his trade, but is consigned so to do when capable.

A Jew's child, from the time that he was circumcised, though then but eight days old, became a debtor (as St. Paul calls it) to perform the law, and an heir of the promises of it, and entered into the covenant of God, and might be called a *covenanter*, as it is said, Deut. xxix. 12, *You and your little ones, &c. do enter into covenant with the Lord, and into his oath, &c.* In the same sense and way of speaking, a Christian's child dedicated to Christ in baptism may be called his *disciple*, or one *grafted into the body of his church*, or as he himself expresses it, Χριστοῦ ὄν, belonging to Christ, or a *Christian*.

Mr. Gale, at p. 187, concludes with this challenge, 'If they will make appear that μαθητεύω can once signify in any passage to make disciples, exclusively of teaching, I will not only alter my present opinion, but,' &c.; and is so fulsome as to begin the next chapter, 'Though I concluded my last with a challenge,' &c. If by *exclusively* he mean *without any relation to teaching*, it is true what he says, 'No man will accept it.' But if he mean 'without a necessary implying of a *present* or *precedent actual* teaching,' I think enough may have been said to shew the vanity of his boasting. Yet I think fitting (as I did in the word βαπτίζω) to refer to a passage which I may be confident he himself has seen.

One may plainly trace him along Pole's Synopsis, for the interpreters that have explained it *teach*; and for the versions (Syr. Arab. Ethiop. &c., with which he makes so long a flourish) that have translated it *teach*. And there he saw, no doubt, those that vindicate the more general sense, *make disciples*, or, as Beza there would have it, in one Latin word, *discipulate*. He who learned from thence that Vatablus expounded βαπτίζονται, Mark vii. 4, *se totos abluebant*, could not but see here his rendering μαθητεύσατε, *make disciples*, nor could miss of seeing the reference to Gataker's vindication of that sense, Adv. iv. 29; and Dr. Lightfoot's observation, that in the phrase of the Jews they are called *disciples* (not only who are actually taught, but also) who are put to be taught; and (what shews the vanity of his challenge) the doctor's quoting to that



purpose Rabb. Schabb. fol. 31. And the heathen intreating Hillel, 'Make me thy proselyte, (or *disciple*,) that thou mayest 'teach me.'

It will be granted that in far the greatest number of passages where this word is used, the circumstances and additions are such as do shew that the author is there speaking of such a disciple as was then in the state of actual and present learning; and the notions of *discipling* and *instructing* do for the most part accompany one another in the same discourse and sentence. And so they do in our use of the word *apprentice*. But the notions themselves are distinct, and may be separate. When we say such an one proves 'a diligent, 'a tractable, or useful apprentice,' or 'a good proficient in his 'trade,' or the like, such sayings carry along with them a connotation of actual and present learning. But if he be sick, or idle, or stupid all his time, the word, as applied to such an one, shall intimate nothing beyond its own precise and proper signification, that he was *put apprentice bound to learn*. And as a direction given in those short words, *Bind your children apprentices* to such or such an one, expresses a notion of the word abstracted from, and preceding to, the notion of their actual learning; so St. Matthew's word, (which is as short,) *Disciple to me all nations*, expresses a notion alike abstracted, and may be understood, either with or without *present* teaching, according to the capacity or incapacity of the person at present; only this it necessarily implies and commands, that the person be *taught*. Which may be (and by the tenor of other texts must be) at present, if he be in a present capacity, or otherwise when he shall be so. A distinction should be made between what the word denotes *strictly, directly, and of itself*, and what only *accidentally*, and according to the circumstances of the subject.

Mr. Gale, p. 165, 166, burlesques the pædobaptists' exposition of the command, and would overthrow it, if a grin would do it, 'Go 'teach all nations, even infants too when they are grown up.' But he brings nothing of argument against such a paraphrase as this: *Go make disciples to me* (or bring and enter into my covenant) *all nations*, (the adult upon their faith, and their infant children upon their parents dedicating them to me,) *baptizing them in the name, &c., teaching them* (even the infants too, when they are grown up) *to observe, &c.*

4. It should be considered that the most important part by far of the work which the apostles were charged with by this commission was to convert the unbelieving nations, to preach the doctrine of

*Jesus* crucified, and raised again, &c., and in a word, to *teach* and preach the gospel; and that this part of their business lay among the adult. For the apostles, when in any city they had preached and converted any number of the *Gentile* people, and prepared them for baptism, commonly did (as our Saviour had done before) leave the baptizing of them, and especially of their children, to deputies; as is plain by what St. Paul says of himself, 1 Cor. i. 17. And that therefore it was proper for the Evangelist to express this office by a word which in most cases comprehends the duty of teaching, which was the main and most difficult work which they were to do in their own persons; the pains which they were to take with the adult. For all writers in their expressions, and translators in their rendering those expressions in another language, aim at words which may best imprint on the mind the chief and most important part of the things they would signify. So that I do not wonder that the English translators, and others whom Mr. Gale here quotes, either of the eastern or western languages, have rendered it *teach*. For though St. Matthew's own word be of a more general and large signification, *make disciples*, yet as words in different languages do seldom exactly answer one another in the whole import of each, the English and other translators could hardly find any one word that did better denote the main of what our Saviour meant by μαθητεύσατε, than such a word as *docete*, *teach*; nor do we yet know of any one English word that will exactly render it, unless we make a new word on purpose, (as St. Matthew's interpreter seems to have done in Greek,) *disciple* all nations; or *proselyte* all nations; which would have been inconvenient in a translation which is chiefly for the use of the unlearned, who would not have understood the meaning of them.

And in Latin there is no word at all that fits it. Dr. Hammond is forced to paraphrase it, *in discipulatum vocare*, 'bring to discipleship.' And even in the Greek, that which St. Matthew's Greek interpreter expresses by one word, μαθητεύειν, *to disciple*, St. John chooses to express by two, chap. iv. 1. Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, *Jesus made and baptized more disciples*. Mr. Gale, at

Page 188, is very angry with Dr. Hammond for comparing these two expressions of the two apostles as parallel, or the one explaining the other. But it is an anger that can do no hurt. For there is no man but himself, that understands the language, but will own at first sight, that they are only two ways of expressing the same thing, as done by our Saviour, and ordered to be done afterward by the apostles; nor does he bring any reason to the contrary, but only

that the doctor in his *Paraphrase* and *Annotations* speaks something differently from what he does in his *Six Queries*. Of which I must say more by and by.

That in the Greek of St. Matthew, μαθητεύσατε, ver. 19, has some difference in signification from διδάσκοντες, ver. 20, is plain from his using those two words, so presently one after the other, to different purposes. For else, if they were exactly synonymous, the sense would have run as incongruously in the Greek, as it does now in the English; *Teach all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.* If he had taken them so, he would probably have said, ‘Teach all nations to observe, &c., baptizing them.’ But he uses different words to this sense, *Proselyte to me all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.* Which difference the *English*, and other translators, for want of proper words in their respective languages, could not preserve. But the sense of Scripture is to be taken from the original, and not to lose its force for want of *English* words.

Another thing that has made the translators the less curious concerning the rendering of this word *teach*, instead of *make disciples*, was, that in the time of making the old translations there were no antipædobaptists (and when the English translation was made, none in England<sup>m</sup>) who should thence take occasion for their error, viz. to conclude, that infants, though a part of the nation, must not be baptized, as not being yet taught. All people then understood it thus; That the apostles going into the heathen nations, must first *teach and convert* the adult persons, and baptize them; and then, at their request, baptize their children into the same covenant. And while all took it so, there was no hurt in letting the word *teach* stand, since it is true that the main thing required of the apostles was, to teach: their main business being, as I said, with the adult. But when there appear men, who catching hold of the word *teach*, are thereby scandalized, or drawn into the erroneous consequence aforesaid; it is then very necessary to make them understand, that St. Matthew’s own word, *make disciples*, does not give occasion for that mistake, because though the way of making disciples which was more especially to be regarded and laboured by the apostles was by teaching the adult; yet the Scripture word is of such a latitude, as to take in any other way of making disciples which is allowable by the tenor of God’s covenant in Christ, into which covenant if children be not by God’s mercy admitted, they are in a woful condition.

<sup>m</sup> [Compare what is said at vol. i. p. 524, 528, &c.]

It is plain that all the translators themselves took the thing to be so, (for I think Mr. Gale will not pretend that any translation was ever made by other than pædobaptists;) and also that all those many authors, whose words he quotes in these two chapters, (I mean the Christian authors,) understood it, that not these words, nor any other words in Scripture, are to be construed to exclude infants from baptism. For they are all pædobaptists; even Mr. Le Clerc and bishop Burnet, whom he so much caresses, and Dr. Whitby, in whom he is so wrapt up, is so, or at least was so, the last time we heard him speak of this matter in print. For in a little pamphlet against Dr. Edwards<sup>n</sup>, having been urged by him, (as some people were formerly by St. Austin,) with the arguments for the doctrine of original sin drawn from the baptism of infants; and having seen in the mean time this book of Mr. Gale's, and in it so many elogiums of himself, he speaks, as nigh as I can remember the words, to this purpose; that he does think that 'infants ought to be baptized;' but yet he would gladly see an answer to the arguments of the learned Mr. Gale to the contrary.

Now to what purpose is it to quote some particular sayings of men to confirm a tenet, which, when we read their books, it appears they never held, nor meant their arguments to that purpose, but the contrary?

5. Whereas he obstinately contends at p. 172 and 178, that *μαθητεύω* is never used as a verb *neuter*, to be a disciple to any one; he shews his temper (or *character*, as he calls it, when he speaks of me) to be, to deny any thing, though never so plain, when it stands, or he does but fancy it to stand, in his way. For fear that *μαθητεύειν τινὰ* should be rendered, to make such or such an one a disciple, *μαθητεύειν τινὰ* shall not signify to be a disciple to such or such; which yet both every man and boy, that reads the language, knows to be so, and every lexicon renders so; and many of his own quotations, (all, as I said before, that he brings from secular authors,) make no sense unless they be rendered so. The first that he brings, p. 173, has plainly the *neuter* signification, to be a disciple, or scholar, to, (so happy he is in applying quotations;) and if any one will bestow the pains to read (as I have been fain, to no purpose, to do) the rest of his quotations where it is construed with a dative case, he will find that in all of them it is used as a *neuter*, and cannot be translated *learn*, or *teach*, or *make disciples*, but *to be a disciple to*. As, p. 179, *being a disciple τῷ πατρὶ, to his Father*: and speaking of

<sup>n</sup> [See 'A full Answer to the argument of the Rev. Jo. Edwards,' &c., 8<sup>o</sup>. 1712.

Preface, p. 4. I have extracted the words above, at chap. v. p. 451.]



Isocrates; such an one, and such an one, ἐμαθήτευσεν αὐτῷ, *were disciples to him*. And in like manner μαθητεῦσαι τισί. And p. 183, 184, 185, out of Clemens Alexandrinus, τοῖς Μάγοις, τῷ Ναζαράτῳ, γνώσει βαρβάρῳ, τῷ Κυρίῳ; and p. 185 out of Origen, τοῖς ἰδιώταις, are all to be translated by *being a disciple to*: to the Magi: to Nazarat us: to the learning of the Barbarians: to the Lord: to ignorant men. Unless Mr. Gale would have us say, Such a man *learned to the Magi*, or *taught to them*, or *was taught to them*. As μαθητὴς is a learner, not a teacher, (with every one but Dr. Whitby,) so μαθητεύειν, when it is active, (as it is often, since St. Matthew's time, in ecclesiastical writers,) is *to make people learners*, or *disciples*; and when it is *neuter*, (as it was always before,) to be *a learner or disciple to*, or *under, any one*.

I happened to look into the *Index* of Clemens Alexandrinus, and there is a reference to three several places of the book where μαθητεύω is found. Two of them are, where it is used in the *neuter* signification; and the index-maker might have noted several more such; but on one he makes a particular note, that it there signifies, *docere ut discipulum*. Mr. Gale sets them down all three with this preface, 'I remember I have read in Clemens Alexandrinus,' (and, I suppose, would have done, if there had been ten,) though two of the three make directly against his notion. Such a man may be well enough employed in searching for quotations, but there ought to be somebody else to judge whether they are for his turn.

He would evade this absurdity of bringing several instances of its *neuter* signification, (when his business was to maintain that there are none,) by supposing, at p. 180, that when μαθητεύειν, is construed with a dative, there is a preposition, σὺν or παρὰ, understood. And says, 'The passage from whence I gather this is a 'good instance against Stephens, Constantine,' &c. (under which &c. are comprehended all lexicons that ever were wrote; and Dr. Busby he had named, as being against him two pages before). The passage is out of Origen.

Now here one would have expected Origen's use of μαθητεύω with such a preposition. But (to the laughter of all schoolboys that shall read it) he instead of it brings in, with a long preface, a quotation of Origen using the *passive* μαθητεύομαι so, μεμαθητευμένοι παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ, *edoctæ apud Patrem; having been instructed when with the Father*. And to expose himself yet more, says, 'Here Origen uses 'μαθητεύειν for the same—as μαρθάνειν,' which is as much as to say, *to teach* is the same as *to learn*. The like work, or worse, he makes in the next paragraph with a passive of *Irenæus*, where there

is no dative at all, *μαθητευθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων*: as if he did not yet understand that though the active, *to teach*, or *make any one a disciple*, or the neuter, *to be a disciple*, does not require a preposition, yet the passive, *to be taught*, or *discipled by any one*, does.

Then there follow fourteen of his quotations more, that are nothing at all to the purpose, not having any thing of *μαθητεύω* in them.

These, you will say, are mean and poor observations. How can I help it, if I am set to answer such a book? He had begun this nonsense at p. 171, where he says, *μανθάνω* ‘signifies properly *docere*, as well as *discere*.’

There is in Scripture an instance of this word used as a neuter. St. Matthew, chap. xxvii. 57, speaking of Joseph of Arimathæa, says, *ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ*. Mr. Gale, if he had had the translating of this, would have rendered it (as he does all the rest of that very construction) without any mention of the word *disciple*. But this being translated to his hand, *was Jesus’ disciple*, he would have the translation altered; and if it were true, which he pretends, that *μανθητεύω* does always signify *actively, to teach*, then this must have been rendered, *who also himself taught to Jesus*. Into such absurdities do people run, when they will obstinately deny things that are plainly true. He would turn it into a passive, *had been instructed, taught, brought over*, or any thing, so it be not *was a disciple to*.

Let us see if St. John’s authority will convince him. He, chap. xix. 38, expresses the same thing: *ὢν μαθητῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, *being a disciple of Jesus*. It is pity this place was not shewed to Mr. Gale, that we might have seen how he would have exercised his faculty of twisting and warping upon it.

He was in the right (if it had been feasible, and if he was resolved, sense or nonsense, to carry his point) to deny that the neuter *μαθητεύω* (which was in use before St. Matthew’s time) signified *to be a disciple*. For if that be granted, that that was the known signification of it before, and St. Matthew only turned it into an active, none will doubt but the active must be, *to make disciples*.

There needs nothing more to be observed of his rhapsody of quotations, but these few general things.

*First*, that a great many of them are, as I said, absolutely impertinent to the purpose; having not the word *μαθητεύω*, nor any derivative of it in them; but are about *ἀκούω*, *audio*, *παιδεύω*, *instituo*, &c.

*Secondly*, that of those which have the word, the far greatest art would have been *best* translated by *making disciples*, or *being dis-*

*ciples to, or being made disciples.* But he without any ground chooses to translate them by *teach, learn, &c.*, which was the question. This any one will see that peruses the places.

*Thirdly*, that there are indeed some of them that are *best* rendered by *teach, or being taught.* And that is nothing but what would have been granted him at first; that where the circumstances of the passage, and of the persons spoken of, do shew it to be meant of adult persons now in the state of learning, there *to make disciples* does import *teaching* of them. And in such places it does often best fit the construction of the sentence to express it *teach.* Because, as I said before, in most places where the word occurs, the *discipling* is by present teaching. But our Saviour, or St. Matthew, or his interpreter, seem to have gone out of the ordinary road of words, to apply here a word of so large a signification as to include any way of *entering disciples*; which is, as I said, agreeable to the tenor of God's covenant, and receiving persons into his fold, or *peculium*.

And this very thing, of choosing a new word on purpose for this sacrament, (viz. *discipling* in general,) is of itself a proof that it is not to be taken in the same limited sense as the word *teaching.* For if it had been to express *teaching*, there were plenty of common and known words in use for that.

Some few passages I shall note as I go along, and so dismiss these two chapters.

Page 168, and again at the end of chap. vii., and again at the beginning of the eighth, he accuses Dr. Hammond of prejudice, partiality, and contradicting himself, when he translates *μαθητεύσατε, make disciples.* And yet he confesses at one of them, p. 189, that most pædobaptists, who argue from that text, do give the word that sense. All that he says of moment (beside his angry and unmannerly censures of that worthy man) is, that though in his 'Answer to Six Queries' he do contend for that sense, and argue from it for the capacity of infants to be disciplined by baptism; and in his 'Dissertations on Episcopacy' render it *in disciplinatum vocate*; yet in his 'Paraphrase and Annotations' he asserts the *direct contrary*, and thus paraphrases the words; 'Teach all nations 'the Christian doctrine,' &c.

I know not what edition of the Paraphrase and Annotations Mr. Gale has met with<sup>o</sup>, nor have at present any opportunity of

<sup>o</sup> [Mr. Gale professes to use that of 1659, which is the first folio, called by the author 'the second edition, corrected 'and enlarged;' the third, of 1671, the

fifth, of 1681, and the sixth, of 1689, agree verbatim with that of 1659, in this passage. This work of Dr. Hammond was first published in an octavo volume,

comparing the several editions ; but I know there is some variety in them as to the notes on this text, and that in some of them the doctor does (as well as in the Six Queries) assert the proper signification to be, *make disciples* : which it is a wonder to me if Mr. Gale was ignorant of. I remember to have seen a pamphlet giving an account of those variations in the later editions, but they do not amount (as Mr. Gale represents) to a *contrariety, or contradiction*. It is to be noted that that great man lived a good part of his time before there were any antipædobaptists in England, or at least before there were any considerable number of them, so as to be taken much notice of (which indeed there were not till that great rebellion) ; and in those former editions (or one of them) he had, it seems, in his Paraphrase, expressed only that which was the *main* part of the office of the apostles given them by this commission, viz. teaching and converting. And there was not then any fear of any one's misunderstanding or perverting the sense, so as to think he meant the other to be excluded. But upon the rise and increase of antipædobaptists, he thought it necessary to guard against their mistake, by giving the full sense of the Scripture word. This is a thing that has happened to many even of the best writers, that before some sect or new opinion has arisen, they have used expressions more unguarded against that error than they would do afterward. So it was with Eusebius in respect of the Arian heresy, and with many others. No man can think that Dr. Hammond ever took those texts, or any text, to be against the baptizing or discipling of infants.

Page 173, he says, that in all the passages wherein he has observed the word, it does necessarily include teaching, 'or at least 'may admit it.' And that if it ever signify 'to disciple, and exclude 'teaching,' (which he thinks it does not,) yet that is not 'the signification in which it is always, or commonly used.'

This is more modest than Mr. Gale uses to be. No doubt it does more *commonly*, i. e. in most of the places where one shall find it used, appear, by the circumstances of the persons there spoken of, to relate to adult persons ; and consequently must be supposed to be accompanied there with present teaching.

Pages 175, 176. Where in a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus Mr. Gale says *μαθητεύειν* is interpreted by Clement himself to mean

in 1653, (and with a reprinted title in 1656 :) in 1657 the author put forth a tract entitled, '*Δευτέραι Φροντίδες*,' or a 'Review of his Paraphrase and Annota-

'tions on the New Testament.'—The fourth edition of the Paraphrase appeared in 1679 ; the seventh in 1698 ; and the eighth in 1702.]



διδάσκειν, as it relates to the angels, and μαρτάνειν, as it relates to persons taught; he should have said μαθητεύσθαι is interpreted μαρτάνειν (for *to be taught* is the same as *to learn*, but *to teach* is not). This mistake he makes ever and anon. And at the foot of that page, (176.) St. Justin's word, μαθητευθήναι εἰς τὰ θεῖα διδάγματα should have been translated, '*made disciples to the divine doctrine.*' For *taught* to it, is neither sense nor language. And so in the page before, (174.) the sayings of Ignatius should have been translated, '*I do now begin μαθητεύεσθαι, to be made a disciple; and I speak to you as fellow-disciples.*' And the next, of giving good examples to the heathens their neighbours, that they might by their works μαθητεῖν, *be made disciples*, or brought to Christianity. And so in most of Mr. Gale's own quotations.

Page 176. That passage of Justin Martyr should be rendered, '*God has not, nor does as yet, bring on his judgment, (meaning the day of judgment,) as knowing that still some every day μαθητεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, are made disciples (or do become) disciples to (or in) the name of his Christ, and do forsake the way of error,*' (and the sentence should have been continued as it is in Justin,) *οἱ καὶ λαμβάνουσι δώματα, ἕκαστος ὡς ἀξιοί εἰσι, φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτου· ὁ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνει συνέσεως πνεῦμα, ὁ δὲ βουλῆς, ὁ δὲ ἰσχύος, ὁ δὲ ἰάσεως, &c. 'Who do also receive gifts (every one as he is worthy) when they are baptized (or enlightened) by the name of this Christ. For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing,' &c.*

Mr. Gale talks of God's delaying to '*pour down his judgments*;' which neither agrees to the words nor the sense. But (what is material to our purpose) the place plainly speaks of baptism, viz. of some daily being made disciples, forsaking idolatry, and being baptized in the name of Christ, and receiving such gifts of the Holy Spirit as the Christians at their baptism are known to have received; many of which (as learned men have proved from this and other passages in St. Justin) did continue in his time to be given Christians at the time of their being baptized, and of the bishops laying their hands on them.

Mr. Gale's exception, (p. 176.) that '*to disciple or proselyte into the name of Christ*' is a phrase never used, is a mere cavil; *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* is to be rendered here as βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, Matt. xxviii. 19, *in the name*.

And his other objection, p. 177, that if φωτιζόμενοι signify here *baptized*, it will make a gross tautology, is a worse; for it is

the same order of words as our Saviour used, *Disciple all the nations, baptizing them.* And his third, that *παρθενο* did not signify *baptized* so early as St. Justin's time, is a shrewd proof of what some have thought, that he has read the fathers no otherwise than by searching such places as the *index* of certain words used in this debate directed him to. It is impossible to read Justin without perceiving that he uses it as an ordinary word for *baptized*. I myself had quoted to Mr. Gale his first apology; where having discoursed largely of baptism, he tells us, that this was one of the common names of it: *Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν, οὐταπισμός*: *this washing is called οὐταπισμός.* And a few lines after, he repeats again, in what name *ὁ οὐταψόμενος βαπτίζεται, the baptized person is washed, viz. of the Father, &c.* And in the next page again, how after the baptism the people go to prayers, praying *ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τοῦ οὐταψέντος καὶ ἑλίκου, &c., both for themselves, and for the baptized person, and all other Christians, &c.,* where he sets down the substance of the prayers, much like those of our church on that occasion.

Page 178. He says, I bring no proof of that sense of *μαθηταίαν* which I give, part ii. chap. 10, nigh the end, viz. that it 'signifies' much like what we say in English; to enter any one as a scholar, 'disciple, or proselyte, to such a master, school, or profession.' That it signifies *to make disciples*, needs no proving. I used the other words as explanatory. And though I mentioned all this matter but in half a page, yet I gave (beside other) one proof to which he can give no answer, from the Jews' use of the word *proselyte* (which is a parallel word to *disciple*) in that manner, calling the adult that were entered at their own desire, *proselytes*, or disciples to Moses, and their infant children entered at the parents' request, *young proselytes*, or disciples. To which I have now added some other proofs of the use of the word, communicated, as I said, by a learned hand. Mr. Gale himself, at p. 190, says, 'Ask a countryman what he means by the word *scholar*, he will tell you, he means one that goes to school to learn.' Right: *to learn*, i. e. that he may learn. But when he is first put to school, and before he has begun actually to learn any thing, he is such a man's scholar. So an infant is baptized, i. e. entered and consigned to Christ as a master, and obliged to *learn* and practise his religion; and though he has not yet, nor does as yet actually learn, he is put to be Christ's scholar or disciple. He is in Justin's phrase, *ἐκ παιδὸς μαθητευθεὶς τῷ Χριστῷ, disciplined to Christ from a child.*

Page 183. He had been bringing there fourteen or fifteen instances of what the words *ἀκούειν*, *ταθεῖν*, &c., do signify in passages

of the authors there quoted; for which, as for an impertinent digression, he ought to have asked the reader's pardon. But instead of it, he says, 'This is a very home argument that μαθητεύω in all such ' places necessarily implies hearing and learning,' &c., and then adds, 'This is sufficiently demonstrated.' It must needs be, that the master to whom Mr. Gale went to school taught his boys to conclude their declamations with some great boast of their performance. For the concluding, that because ἀκούω, παιδεύω, &c., do necessarily imply present learning and teaching, &c., therefore μαθητεύω does, is much such a 'demonstration' as the countryman gave of the cause of *Godwin sands*<sup>p</sup>.

Page 186, he tells his 'sir,' that always sits by him, something of his mind. 'I would choose rather to lay that phrase (make disciples) aside.' And a little after, 'If it be rendered *make disciples*, ' our adversaries take an advantage,' &c. I commend him: and I suppose his friend wishes so too. But then they must contrive to have the *Greek* word itself laid aside too, and changed for some other word. I could tell them of texts of Scripture which several sorts of men would wish to be laid aside. Some, the first three verses of St. John; some, the first verses of Rom. xiii; but these are vain wishes: it is better to lay the schism aside. The phrase *make disciples* will always stand either in the text, or, as it does now, in the marginal notes of our English Bibles, both at Matt. xxviii. 19, and in Acts xiv. 21, as the proper and grammatical sense of the word.

Page 191, he gives me very foul language. My 'assertion grossly ' false.' 'A great dishonour and disservice to religion, that any who ' are teachers of it, and appointed to guide the people, should endeavour to support their fancies by a fallacy.' Thus I have lived to have an ill-behaved schismatic, and one whom for age I may account a boy<sup>q</sup>, affront and abuse me in respect of my office; and all, only for affirming a thing which every one that reads the Scripture must own to be a truth.

p [Namely, that the sand-bank was caused by the erection of Tenterden steeple. The *real* origin of this dangerous bank is thus recorded by Stow, in his *Chronicle of England*, at the year 1099:

'This year, as well in Scotland as in ' England, the sea brake in over the ' banks of the Thames and other rivers, ' drowning many towns and much people, ' with innumerable numbers of oxen and ' sheep. At which time the lands in ' Kent, that sometime belonged to Duke ' Godwine, earl of Kent, were covered ' with sands and drowned; which are to

' this day called *Godwyne sands*.'

The reader may likewise consult Lambard's '*Perambulation of Kent*;' or an extract from it given in Brayley's *Beauties of England*, vol. viii. p. 1025: where also is related, out of sir Thomas More's *Dialogues*, the anecdote which seems to have given rise to the vulgar opinion alluded to by Dr. Wall in the text.]

q [It appears that Mr. Gale was born in 1680, which would make him about five and thirty years younger than Dr. Wall.]



I had observed that St. Peter, speaking, Acts xv. 10, against the imposing of circumcision on the heathen converts, (*and their children*, so I had expressed it,) words it thus: *to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples*. He styles those on whom this yoke was intended to be put, *μαθητὰς, disciples*; and I said, that it was *infants especially* on whom this yoke was attempted to be put.

He says, it was disingenuous to express it, heathen converts ‘and their children,’ and ‘much worse, to assert downright, that it was infants *especially* on whom,’ &c. And his reason is, because ‘infants are no where mentioned; nor is any thing said which can be applied to them in the whole chapter.’ And because the men only are mentioned, he concludes, p. 191, that ‘by *μαθητῶν, the disciples*, the apostle intends only the converts, exclusively of their ‘infants, if they had any.’

Now I say, that every one that reads the Scripture, and the rules that it always gives concerning circumcision, must understand the attempt of imposing it to have reached, and to have been intended, to the children as well as their fathers; and that (though they be not mentioned, yet) the nature of the thing does of itself evince it.

For whether it be Jews, the seed of Abraham, or proselytes to them, that receive circumcision; it is notorious that all of them received it on these terms, that they *and all their male children* of eight days old or above, were to undergo it. This might be proved from the case of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 12, 13. item xxi. 4; of any proselytes, Gen. xxxiv. 15, Exod. xii. 48. But I forbear to spend time in the proof of a thing, which every body, but he, understands.

Moreover these Jewish believers, who disputed among themselves whether this yoke of circumcision should be laid on the *Gentile* believers or not, did practise it thus in respect to their own children: as appears from Acts xxi. 20, 21. And can any one now think that those sticklers for circumcision, mentioned Acts xv. 5, who held it was needful to circumcise the *Gentile* converts, did not mean that those *Gentile* converts should do as they did, viz. circumcise their children too? The children are not mentioned; but a circumstance, plain by the nature of the thing, needs it not.

He imputes ‘gross falsehood’ to me. But either that, or else *gross ignorance*, belongs to him, when he says, it was meant ‘exclusively of their infants, if they had any.’ Whereas no rule of circumcision was ever meant so. He seems to think that it was used, as the antipædobaptists would have baptism to be, ‘exclusively of children.’ But even they do know that circumcision,



and all other Christians that baptism, have been ever used *inclusively* of them.

And that which I said, that it was children *especially* on whom the weight of this yoke would have fallen, is so plain and easy to account for, that he must be shamefully dull that needs the explanation. For if a man of adult age had received this doctrine, he himself must have been circumcised; but so must all his male children too. This may be counted equal. But in the succeeding generations it would have fallen on the infant children only. So that I had good reason to say, that they were *children especially* on whom this yoke would have come.

Page 205, he names another place of my book, where I 'insinuated' (but how is his confidence sunk! He was wont, when he affixed a false thing on me, to say, I *owned* it) that the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, and the comment of St. Hierome on it, relate only to adult persons. I had the patience to turn to the place of my book that he refers to, and do find his accusation false. I think not to take that pains again, but if he say such things of me, to conclude them to be false by the custom. The reader may consult the place if he please. But if I had 'insinuated' so, how absurd is he to spend two chapters against me, to prove what I myself had 'insinuated' or taught!

Next, having much leisure, he brings some texts to prove that the apostles were to preach the gospel where they came. And then concludes, not forgetting to assure us, that what he has said does 'plainly demonstrate.' So it does; something.

But it is pretty to observe what a liberty he takes in talking of the method of my book. He at the latter end of this chapter, and beginning of the next, brags that he has discovered 'an error in my 'very foundation, in the very groundwork of my system.' And he means this observation concerning the word μαθητεύσατε to be that foundation and groundwork. Whereas I never mentioned any thing about that matter, but in half a page near the end of my book; as in a history there was no occasion.

These two chapters were collections made, I suppose, before by him, or somebody; and he puts upon the antipædobaptists, by making them believe they were wrote against me.

## CHAP. IX.

HERE is the first place that he brings his answers or reflections into any appearance of a method; and now above half his book is over, begins to answer my introduction, concerning the Jewish baptism of proselytes and their children. He spends two chapters in opposing what I had said of that. If I could have foreseen that we should have had so full an account of that matter as the learned Dr. Wootton has since published<sup>r</sup>; I might well have spared my pains in answering these two chapters. But as I had drawn up the answers to the particular objections he makes against me before I heard of that book published, let them stand. A reader that has perused that will, I suppose, have no need of them, and may pass them by. Every body will see an instance of Mr. Gale's assurance in denying things that are so certain as this had been before shewed to be, and is now so incontestably confirmed by that elaborate work.

His first exception against the passages of the books of Jewish writers which I produce is, that they are not so ancient as to be able to inform us of the customs of the Jews that lived in or before our Saviour's time; that the Misna, or text of the Talmud, (which is the ancientest that I cite,) was not compiled till about one hundred and fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem; that is, two hundred and ten years after Christ's birth. So he says; but men of the best learning in that history prove that it was composed by Rabbi Judah Hakodesh, seventy years sooner, in the midst of the second century, in the time of Antoninus Pius. I refer myself to Dr. Prideaux<sup>s</sup>, *Connection of Hist.* part i. lib. 5. p. 257, who makes it plain by circumstances too long to be here repeated.

Now two hundred and ten years after Christ's birth is but one hundred and eighty after his and St. John's baptizing; and one hundred and fifty is but one hundred and twenty: which, in the scarcity of books that are left to us, is an early date for Jewish or Christian writers, (especially when seconded by so many following testimonies,) as he knows well enough, and fills his book with

<sup>r</sup> [In a work entitled, 'Miscellaneous Discourses relating to the Traditions and Usages of the Scribes and Pharisees in the time of our Blessed Saviour.' 2 vols. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1718. i. e. published two years before this piece of Dr. Wall's.]

<sup>s</sup> [See the Old and New Testament

connected, in the history of the Jews and neighbouring nations, by Humphry Prideaux, D.D. second edition, 3 vols. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1716, &c., vol. i. p. 326, &c.; third edition, fol. London, 1717, 1718. vol. i. p. 257, &c.; 8<sup>o</sup>. Oxford, 1820, vol. ii. p. 99.]

authorities of a much fresher date, though here he spend two pages in a showy flourish, and address to his *sir*; ‘Now, sir, can any ‘reasonable man take the reports of authors who wrote so long ‘after,’ &c., and yet at last says, p. 211, that he ‘will not insist ‘upon this.’ And yet in the next chapter (if that be writ by the same man) resumes it again at p. 237, 238; observing that Philo and Josephus, who are something elder, have no mention of this custom of baptizing proselytes. To which an answer must be made here, if any where; and if one would bring his immethodical arguings into any brevity.

It is much such an argument as that of Mr. Tombes, which I recited, was against the antiquity of infant-baptism among the Christians; that among all the ancient Christians that mention it, Eusebius and some others have nothing about it. Philo was all taken up with allegorical and philosophical flights. Josephus wrote the History and Antiquities of the Jews in much the same way as Eusebius of the Christians; their original, their kings, their high priests, their wars, &c. In no such books one can reasonably expect an account of their rituals, or the ceremonies of admitting proselytes into their religion. But the *Talmud*, and books of the rabbis, which I cited, do contain (as our Common Prayer Book does, for our religious usages) the rubrics for their ceremonies of this sort.

Mr. Gale, at that p. 238, refers us to two passages of Josephus, lib. xiii, where he thinks this initiatory baptism would have been mentioned if it had been in use in the time of the Maccabees and later kings. Hyrcanus having subdued the Edomites, suffered them to continue in that country, ‘on condition they would be circumcised, and live according to the Jewish laws. And they, out of ‘love to their native country, complied to receive circumcision, and ‘live after the fashion of the Jews.’ And the like expressions he uses in the next chapter but one, in relating the like terms required of the Ituræans, who had been conquered by Aristobulus.

Here Mr. Gale concludes, that at this time proselytes were not used to be baptized, but circumcised only; because Josephus, mentioning one, says nothing of the other. Indeed he does not make his argument so fair as to say, ‘he does not mention it;’ but boldly says, ‘Josephus informs us, that Hyrcanus made and initiated ‘them Jews *by circumcision only*.’ But the words are as I have recited.

Circumcision is here by Josephus mentioned, as the chief and most remarkable circumstance whereby the Jews were distinguished.

It was also the most difficult and painful of the things imposed, and (as one Mr. Stokes<sup>t</sup>, a writer against Mr. Gale, whose book I have but just now seen, and who has dubbed him Dr. Gale, observes) it was most contemned by other nations; so that the chief difficulty was in forcing them to receive that. Baptism, as an easy thing, and not unusual among other nations, may well be supposed to be included in the general words, 'the other Jewish laws.'

An argument which prevailed with Mr. Emlyn, (as I noted before,) and does prevail with most that speak of this matter, is, that since it is notorious that the Jews have such a custom now, of baptizing their proselytes; and it appears by their books that they had the same in the times within less than one hundred and fifty years of our Saviour, and they spoke then of it as a custom always used by their nation, and that it cannot be conceived that they would borrow it, or use it in imitation of our Saviour Christ, or the Christians, whom they disdained and abominated: there is all reason to conclude that they derived it from their ancestors, as they say they did. None can maintain the contrary, but one whom his hypothesis forces; especially when the Scripture itself speaks of *baptizing* unto Moses.

Therefore Mr. Gale here says, he will not insist upon it. But he does a worse thing. He denies a plain matter of fact that was before his eyes. He says of the passages cited by me, 'Not one does so much as assert or intimate that the baptism of proselytes was in use in our Saviour's time.' Mr. Stokes has found him tardy; and has referred him to the first of them, which speaks of the use of it in David and Solomon's time. And there are (as he tells him) several others. And indeed nobody that had eyes could miss them. Yet he, at p. 214, 215, says it over again.

Page 211. Another shift is, that perhaps 'they do not speak of an initiatory baptism, but only a purification from the blood of 'circumcision.'

<sup>t</sup> [Of this writer we have the following account in Ivimey's history of the Baptists, vol. iv.

'Mr. Joseph Stokes, a Presbyterian minister at Horsham in Sussex, published in 1715 a little pamphlet in defence of 'infant-baptism, entitled, "A Survey of 'Infant-baptism and the mode of baptizing, in a letter to a gentleman at 'London.'" 8vo. containing thirty-two pages.)

And again: 'Mr. Jos. Stokes of Horsham, a champion of paedobaptism—

'published in this year (1717) an octavo work in reply to Dr. Gale's treatise. It was entitled, "A Compassionate Plea for Infants; or Remarks on Dr. Gale's 'Reflections on Mr. Wall's History of 'Infant-baptism.'" This book and his 'former pamphlet were answered by a 'Mr. John Tasker.'

I have not been able to meet with this latter work of Mr. Stokes, therefore have had no opportunity of verifying Dr. Wall's quotations in this instance.]



His reader, that will read the passages over again, must be ashamed for him. They do all speak of entering *proselytes*; some, adult; some, infants; some, males; some, females. And whereas he would except those found in the Misna itself, there are none that mention *proselyting* plainer than they. And they also instance in *female* children; which makes his exception concerning the blood of circumcision to be absolute nonsense.

Page 211, he would prove a thing that is a direct contradiction to what he had said the page before. For there he had yielded that a passage there produced out of the Talmud did 'shew indeed what ' was the method when that was written, but not that the same ' custom had been observed for two hundred years before.' But here he produces two *Jewish* writers, from some of whose words he would conclude that they knew of no baptism of proselytes at all, as used by their nation, but took it to be a ceremony first instituted by John or Christ.

I shall by no means transcribe passages so impertinent. Most of them speak of the custom of baptizing *Jews* or any persons born of *faithful* parents, as a new thing brought up by John or Christ; and not then, or formerly, used by their nation; which is nothing to the baptizing of proselytes from among the heathens.

And besides, if these two had, in their spite to the Christians, vented slanders which would have recoiled upon their own religion, (as some eager disputants commonly do, go on so fiercely in ruining other men's foundations, that they undermine their own,) should we thence conclude against plain proofs that the *Jews* had no such religion? What are two (as Mr. Stokes observes) against a cloud of witnesses? What are conclusions drawn by consequence from some raging blasphemous expressions, to full attested matter of fact?—Two obscure authors, to the *Talmuds*, and the generally owned and received books of that time and ever since, and the known present practice of the nation? If Mr. Gale's cause have no other hopes but in the denial of such publicly attested facts, it is plainly desperate. Besides, that one of his authors (whom he styles ancient) speaks of the *Christians* as baptizing their infants. Let Mr. Gale believe his *rabbi* for that, if he plead his credit as to the other.

The last shift to which he flies, at

Page 215, does not help. He would argue the insufficiency of the evidence which is taken from any writings of the rabbins, to prove what was their practice from hence, that those Jews 'are a ' despicable, ignorant, and whimsical sort of writers.'

To which I need give no other answer than that which I gave

before to the very same objection in his fourth chapter, p. 106, which I entreat the reader for once to recur to.

From this page 215, the next nine pages, to 224, are such as any Christian reader of Mr. Gale's book ought to tear out, and burn without reading them. They are nothing at all to the purpose of baptism, infant or adult, Jewish or Christian. They are a kennel of stinking blasphemies, and burlesque on the Christian religion. What conceit made him translate and publish them in *English*, it is hard to guess. It is just as if somebody lighting on some of the late English atheistical pamphlets of Blount, or of———or——— should think it a good employment, instead of burning them, to translate them into other languages, and send them about the world. The book called *Toldoth Jesu*, (out of which he takes the most,) is a book commonly mentioned with abhorrence for its blasphemy, and scorn for its dulness. I think I remember some years ago an advertisement in the Holland prints, of somebody that had translated it into some vulgar language; and had a conceit of his skill in doing it enough, and reverence for Christ little enough, to desire it might be published; but his friends, being Christians, overruled him, and got him to burn it. I have forgot the man's name, I think it could not be Mr. Gale, because of his age; but certainly some such friends Mr. Gale wanted at this time, when he resolved, at p. 216, 'to venture' (as he calls it) to mention some of the least shocking of those blasphemies; even these do shock every Christian reader.

The old blasphemous books of Celsus, Porphyry, Julian the Apostate, and others then written against the Christian religion, though set forth with a great deal of wit and learning, (such as makes our modern atheists and deists look, in comparison, as a parcel of very sordid imitators,) and therefore thought fit by some Christians to be preserved, were however, for the odiousness of the subject, by the far major part thought fitter to be burned; and accordingly they (and also the books of the old blasphemous heretics) are (except some fragments, which by being confuted have been preserved) long ago extinguished. How much more ought this putid rubbish, which Mr. Gale here rakes together and translates, to have been so served!

Those rabbins, out of whom he fetches these blasphemies, are not (I think not one of them) those whom I had cited as mentioning the *Jewish* baptisms. And if they had, it had been nothing to the purpose. No more, than if I had quoted *Tacitus* upon any dispute of the *Roman* customs or history, he should for answer have recited

and translated for the use of an *English* reader those vile reproaches which that historian casts on the Jews and Christians; on God, and on our blessed Saviour.

The testimony of those Christian writers which he quotes, from that p. 224, to the end of the chapter, setting forth the character of the Jewish writers; as, that they are for the most part a vain, trifling, enthusiastic, perverse, and superstitious sort of people, (for which he cites Justin Martyr, Scaliger, Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Du Pin, Le Clerc, and especially St. John Baptist, and St. Stephen,) is certainly true, and known to be so by every body; and one that spends so many words in proving it must be almost as trifling as they; especially where it is nothing to the purpose, as it is not here, since (as I have been forced often to say) we do not appeal to them for any thing wherein their candour, judgment, or sincerity is depended on, but only perceive by their writings, and ritual books, what their usages and tenets are. And this use of their writings, Mr. Gale knows very well, that several of these same learned men, particularly Buxtorf and Lightfoot, do make to good purpose. For though they have no opinion of the men, yet from their books and disputings they came to a more particular understanding of their customs, to which customs the phrases of Scripture do often allude and refer, and the sense and meaning of such places of Scripture is thereby better understood.

---

## CHAP. X.

BESIDES the Jewish writers themselves, I quoted other ancient writers, some heathens, some Christians, mentioning the *Jewish* custom of baptizing proselytes. One was Arrian, a philosopher living at Rome.

Mr. Gale excepts against his evidence, as not early enough; one hundred and fifty years after Christ.

Suppose it were so much after Christ's *birth*, (as it was almost;) is not this an evidence coming very near to the time of John's and Christ's baptizing?

He says again, that perhaps *Arrian* might mistake the *Christians* for the *Jews*; and spends several pages in reaching after probabilities for this conjecture: but those so rambling, and little to the purpose, that I, who knew that a learned man or two had spoken of this as possible, do count it less probable after having read these pages.

At best it is but a conjecture. The plain words, repeated several times, are, *the Jews*. The same answerer should not give both these answers: *first*, that it was too long after Christ's time; *secondly*, that it was not long enough after his time for the *Christians* to be distinguished from the *Jews*. If there were no other evidence beside this, that the Jews used baptism as well as the Christians, there were more room for this guess; but this, corroborated by so many more, renders the evasion very precarious.

Page 233, he is fain to use the very same shift for Gregory Nazianzen, that he lived too late to be an evidence. All learned men know how much his testimony is valued for the customs of Christians, and there is the same reason for his knowing those of the Jews, many of whom lived in that country.

Mr. Gale says, [p. 234,] his words may be understood (nay, he insults any one that understands them otherwise) of washings for uncleanness, and not of any initiatory baptism. This he confidently says, though the comparison be there purposely made between Moses' baptism and John's, which was an initiatory one; and Christ's, which was also plainly such: and though the words themselves (Moses baptized, but that was with water only; and before that, in the cloud and in the sea) do compare two several baptisms of Moses, that at mount Sinai, with that in the cloud and in the sea; which last St. Paul himself speaks of as an initiatory baptism, and a type of the Christian baptism, and laying like obligations on the Jews, as the other does on Christians; which is a quite different purpose from that of washings for uncleanness.

I quoted St. Cyprian and St. Basil speaking of the same *Jewish* baptism. Mr. Gale did not care to repeat them; and has nothing else to say, but that they amount to no more than St. Gregory's; and if they amount to so much, it is sufficient; especially since St. Cyprian will surely be allowed for an ancient evidence. And he is there giving the reason why the apostles in instructing and baptizing a *few*, had no need of pains to teach him the doctrine and belief of the Father, but only of the Son. (Whereas a *Gentile* must be instructed concerning the Father as well as the Son and the Holy Spirit.) 'For the Jews had,' says he, 'already, and a long time ago, the baptism of the law and of Moses, and were now to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.' Now could any man living, beside Mr. Gale, have the forehead to say that St. Cyprian does not here speak of such a *Mosaical* baptism as was initiatory into a certain faith or profession, the faith of the true God?



Though this, and some of the rest, be exceeding plain, yet this answerer draws his conclusion, at

Page 234, without altering his countenance at all, but turning confidently to his *sir*, tells him, ‘It is sufficiently evident Mr. Wall ‘has said nothing which rises to any probable proof——For I leave ‘you to judge whether every pretence to this has not been sufficiently refuted.’ He puts a great confidence in his judge.

I quoted Tertullian, ancienter than any of the rest, and also St. Paul, testifying that *all the Jews*, at their coming out of Egypt, (before the washings for legal pollutions were instituted,) *were baptized unto Moses*, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, which same expression St. Cyprian (as I shewed) uses for their being baptized into the faith of Jehovah. To all this he says nothing.

Page 234, he will no longer be on the defensive, but will undertake to prove the negative, viz. that the Jews had no initiatory baptism. The Scripture, he says, makes no mention of it, though I had quoted St. Paul’s words just before. I added also another text, Exod. xix. 10, which the Jews themselves, as I shewed, understood of an initiatory baptism at their entering into the covenant of the Ten Commandments and other laws at mount Sinai or Horeb.

He proves that they could not then by that washing at Sinai enter into covenant, ‘for that they had done before by circumcision.’

This he says, though the Scripture does expressly say, that they did *then* enter into covenant; and there be recited the particular interrogations and answers of it; and in a recital of another covenant forty years after, Deut. xxix. 1, it be said, that that covenant *in the land of Moab was beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb*. Though they had circumcision, as the seal of the covenant with Abraham, that does not hinder but baptism might be a seal of this; as the Jewish writers do all say, that their fathers entered into covenant by these three things: circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice; and of this last also the Scripture uses the same phrase, Psalm l. 5, *Those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice*.

Page 235. Whereas the words of that text, Exod. xix. 10, 11, are, *Sanctify them, &c., and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day, &c.* And I had shewn from *Maimonides*, the *Gemara*, *Aben Ezra*, *Selden* quoting a great number of rabbis, that (beside their understanding that *sanctifying* to be *washing*) the *Jews* did apprehend, that wherever in the law the washing of the clothes

is commanded, it means much more the washing of the body itself: he denies that phrase to be so meant, and yet in the same page (p. 235,) heedlessly recites one of the texts from which it is plainly proved; which is Numb. xxxi. 19, 24. There all that Eleazar prescribes to such as had killed any person, or touched any slain, was, *to purify themselves, &c. And ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean.* Now it is plain from Numb. xix. 16—19, that every person in their circumstances was to wash or bathe his whole body, as well as his clothes.

Page 237, 238. What he produces here out of Josephus and Philo, I shewed just now, in answering the beginning of his ninth chapter, (where this ought to have come in, if any where,) to be nothing to the purpose.

Page 238. If ever any man confuted himself, our author does it here. For his business was to deny that the Jews had any initiatory baptism, and particularly that the Scripture nowhere speaks of any such thing. And whereas I had produced two places of Scripture that do speak of it; he proves here, that the one does not speak of it, because the other does. St. Paul speaks of it, 1 Cor. x. therefore Exod. xix. does not. Whereas if either of them speak of it, his argument is lost. That *in the cloud and in the sea* St. Paul calls *a baptism*. But that having been done in a transient and typical way, and without express covenanting, there might be afterward at Horeb a more explicit performance of the ceremonies.

By just the same arguing he in the next page, p. 239, overthrows the testimony which I brought of Nazianzen, Orat. 39; where he refers to both the said texts of Scripture, and distinguishes the two times. Mr. Gale pleads that Nazianzen paraphrases 1 Cor. x. ‘The sea typified the water, the cloud the Spirit.’ True. But does not he, beside this, speak of the other? ‘Moses gave them a baptism; but that was with water only. And *πρὸ τοῦτου*, before that, they were baptized *in the cloud and in the sea.*’

Page 239, he falls again upon that plea, (which has been used two or three times, though not worth once using,) that he can name writers that make no mention of this Jewish baptism. ‘Barnabas,’ he says, ‘has not one word.’ And then two pages more spent in shewing that Justin Martyr has not one word of it neither. Does he think any one will read them over to see whether he say true or not? What does it avail that they do not mention it, if St. Paul, and the Christian writers which I quoted, and so many of the Jewish writers themselves do?

But he produces a place in Justin, where he thinks it must have

been mentioned, if there had been any such thing. *Trypho* acknowledges that the passover and other sacrifices could not be used, now that the *temple* was destroyed. *Justin* asks, what part of the legal ordinances did remain in use at such a time. *Trypho* answers, ‘The sabbaths, circumcision, the new moons, and baptizing upon ‘uncleanness.’ Here Mr. Gale says, he would have mentioned this other initiatory baptism, if it had been in use with them.

He is so forgetful, or impertinent, as not to mind that this initiatory baptism was not by *Trypho* accounted necessary to the *Jews* themselves; but only to *heathens* proselyted. And *Trypho* was speaking only of what the *Jews* were to do.

And this, if he had thought of it, would have made him omit the quoting both that other place of *Justin* which he brings, p. 240, and the following one of *Tertullian*, p. 241, where he urges that *Tertullian* makes baptism to be ‘a new ordinance.’ But the sense of the place is only this, that it began but now at Christ’s time to be used on any posterity of the faithful.

Page 242. The saying of *Origen*, *Comment. in Joann.* p. 116, 117<sup>n</sup>, looks most plausible for his turn of any; where *Origen* says, ‘He ‘[*Heracleon*] cannot shew that any prophet did baptize.’ Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δεῖξαι τῶν προφητῶν βαπτίσαντα.

But it is a proof, how a scrap of a line or two out of a discourse may be perverted by those that have the baseness to do it, to a sense quite contrary to the import of the discourse itself.

*Origen* is there commenting on that question of the Pharisees put to *John Baptist*, *John* i. 25; *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?* He had observed before, p. 109, the difference between *προφήτης* and *ὁ προφήτης*, a prophet indefinitely, and that prophet; and that the question of the *Jews* is not to be understood concerning the ordinary prophets, but one particular one, whom they expected to come, that should be like unto *Moses*; as *Moses* himself had foretold, *Deut.* xviii. And having by the way blamed many passages in *Heracleon*’s comment on that text, and particularly that he had understood the word *ὁ προφήτης*, in that question, of a prophet at large; he says, p. 116, that there may very well be returned this answer to that insulting demand of the Pharisees, who seem to have thought that the Christ and *Elias* were to baptize in their own persons; but that he that was the voice of one crying in the wilderness, &c., might not baptize at all.

‘You, sirs, do put to him who was sent as a messenger before the

<sup>n</sup> [Op. tom. iv. p. 125. *Comment.* vi. sect. 13. edit. *Benedict.*]

‘ face of the Christ, to prepare his way before him, an unhandsome  
 ‘ interrogation, being ignorant of all the mysteries that belong to his  
 ‘ office. For *the Christ* (and Jesus was he, though you would not  
 ‘ have it so) did not baptize himself, (or in his own person,) but his  
 ‘ disciples. And he it was that was *that Prophet*. And what  
 ‘ makes you think that Elias when he comes will baptize οὐδὲ τὰ  
 ‘ ἐπὶ τὰ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ξύλα, κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Ἀχαάβ χρόνους, δεόμενα  
 ‘ λούτροῦ, ἵνα ἐκκαυθῇ, ἐπιφανέντος ἐν πυρὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, βαπτίσαντος;  
 ‘ ἐπικελεύεται γὰρ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; who in Ahab’s time did  
 ‘ not baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be washed  
 ‘ before it was burnt up, when the Lord should shew himself in fire?  
 ‘ For he ordered the priests to do that; not only once; for he says,  
 ‘ *Do it the second time, &c.* Ὁ τοίνυν μὴ αὐτὸς βαπτίσας τότε, ἀλλ’  
 ‘ ἑτέροις τοῦ ἔργου παραχωρήσας. He therefore who did not himself  
 ‘ (or in his own person) baptize at that time, but left that work to  
 ‘ others, how was he likely to baptize, βαπτίζειν ἐμελλε, when he,  
 ‘ according to Malachi’s prophecy, came? Therefore the Christ does  
 ‘ not baptize with water, but his disciples; and he reserves to him-  
 ‘ self the baptizing with the Holy Spirit and with fire. But Hera-  
 ‘ cleon admitting this speech of the Pharisees as good sense, περὶ  
 ‘ τοῦ ὀφείλεισθαι τὸ βαπτίζειν Χριστῷ καὶ Ἰησῆ καὶ παντὶ Προφήτῃ,  
 ‘ αὐταῖς λέξεσί φησιν, Οἷς μόνοις ὀφείλεται τὸ βαπτίζειν καὶ ἐκ τῶν  
 ‘ εἰρημένων μὲν ἡμῖν ἑναγχος ἐλεγχόμενος, μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι κοινότερον τὸν  
 ‘ προφήτην νενόηκεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δεῖξαι τινα τῶν Προφητῶν βαπτί-  
 ‘ σαντα:—that both the Christ, and Elias, and *every prophet* ought  
 ‘ to baptize: adds in express words; *to whom alone the duty of bap-*  
 ‘ *tizing belongs.* Who is sufficiently confuted by what I have just  
 ‘ now said, especially where he takes the word for any ordinary  
 ‘ prophet. For he cannot shew that any prophet did baptize.’

Here the reader will observe these things :

*First*, what a trouble one has with such a quoter. For it is neces-  
 sary to produce long passages *verbatim*, to shew the fallacy that lies  
 hid in bringing a scrap of them to a purpose contrary to the true  
 tenor of them. And therefore all ingenuous quoters, all that aim at  
 truth, do scorn such a practice as much as they do false quoting.

*Secondly*, he will see that neither Heraclion, whom Origen con-  
 futes, nor Origen himself, do speak as if they thought there was no  
 such baptism in the Jewish economy; but on the contrary they  
 plainly suppose that there was such a thing, and that the *Pharisees*  
 do here refer to it: only the *Pharisees* thought it was not to be  
 administered to natural Jews by any, after Moses’ time, but the  
*Christ*, or *Elias*, or *that Prophet* whom they expected unto like Moses.



And they thought that *Prophet* a different person from the *Christ* ; but Origen shews them to be both one, and that *Jesus* was he.

And besides ; Origen tells them that they had no reason to think that *Elias*, or the *Christ*, would baptize in their own persons, but by deputies ; as *Elias* did not baptize the wood himself, but ordered it to be done ; and as *Jesus* when he came did not himself baptize, but his disciples.

Heracleon thought that not only these, but any prophet might baptize. Origen shews him to be mistaken in that ; if he mean *κοινότερόν τινα προφήτην*, any ordinary prophet ; since he cannot shew that any prophet (meaning such an one) did use to baptize ; nor the greater ones by themselves. So manifestly does Mr. Gale pervert the sense ; when to Origen's words *any prophet*, he (in spite of Origen's distinction expressed in the line before) adds *Moses*, rendering it, *not any prophet, neither Moses, nor, &c.*

Both Origen, and this heretic Heracleon, must have well known the customs of the Jews, for they both lived at Alexandria in Egypt, where great numbers of Jews dwelt. Origen, one hundred and ten years after the apostles ; and Heracleon eighty years before, viz. thirty years after the apostles.

*Thirdly*, he will see that Origen here does plainly call pouring water on a thing, *baptizing* it. For what *Elias* ordered, 1 Kings xviii. 33, was, *Fill four barrels of water, and pour it on the burnt-sacrifice, and on the wood.* And this he styles the *baptism* of the wood and sacrifice. Which should have made Mr. Gale, when he read and quoted this place, for shame to have retracted what he so confidently had averred in his third, fourth, and fifth chapters, that *baptizing* never in authors signifies *pouring* of water, but always *dipping*.

What follows from this page to p. 243 and the usual boast with which he there concludes, I may well enough pass by. For what if St. Cyril, and the *Recognitions* and *Constitutions*, (which if I had quoted, he would have made an outcry of their being spurious,) and Mr. Hill<sup>x</sup>, do speak of other things, used by the Jews and omitted by Christians ; as sacrifices, legal washings, &c., the want of which things baptism does supply to us ; and they do not at those particular places speak of this initiatory baptism of the Jewish nation at once, or of proselytes as they came in ? Does it follow that a thing is not mentioned at all by authors, because it is not mentioned at every place where it might have been ? or is it (as he would here, p. 243, represent) any absurdity in the pædobaptists to maintain that both circumcision and the Jewish baptism might be types and

<sup>x</sup> [See a quotation from his work 'De Presbyteratu,' at vol. i. p. 243.]

forerunners of Christian baptism? The other sacrament, of the Lord's Supper, was signified by more than one judicial rite. He indeed stoutly concludes with averring that the Fathers whom I quoted 'do not afford the least intimation,' &c. But the reader by this time knows the man. He is the same that before would have made us believe that the rabbis themselves do not sufficiently confirm their own customs, because there were two or three that did not mention them. And if he were urged with the custom which the Jews to this day do observe of baptizing proselytes, he looks as if he would deny it. But this is all face. And so is what comes next,

Page 244, where he says, 'This custom of the Jews, though ever 'so true, can do no service, &c., for it does not in the least appear 'that infants were so admitted.' Any one that had read my quotations concerning this custom must needs here be amazed, because they speak of infants very particularly. But he says, I bring not 'the least colour of an argument; but only cite,' &c. Do matters of history or ancient facts use to be proved by *arguments*, or by *citations* of book of those times? But he says, I cite only *rabbis*. If that be all he has to object, why did he put the case; this custom, 'though ever so true?' So it comes to the old evasion; the *Jewish* writers are men of no great judgment; therefore they cannot tell their own custom; whether at the baptism of a proselyte they did use to admit his children to baptism with him.

At last, he will suppose it all to be true. And if by adding he can do any mischief, will put some more to it. He mentions two cases, p. 245, (which yet are really but one,) wherein the Christian baptism ought, he says, by my argument to imitate the *Jewish*; which yet it does not, viz. the confining the use of baptism to new proselytes only. So that as the Jews, after the general baptism of their nation in Moses' time, did not continue to baptize their own children, either in infancy or adult age; but only proselytes and their children; so Christians should, if my argument be good, omit the baptizing of all that are born of baptized parents.

And to enforce this absurd consequence upon me, he sticks not at a practice which is base in any writer. He takes five or six words of mine, ('our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration,') which I had affixed to one sentence, to one purpose; and affixes them to a sentence of another nature, and a contrary purpose. I had, in that page which he quotes of mine, mentioned that custom of the Jews of omitting baptism in the case of the posterity of baptized persons;

and had shewed from John iii. 6, 7, that that was by our Saviour altered. But going on to speak of that practice of the Jews, 'that  
' all persons, whom they baptized at all, they baptized in infancy, if  
' they had the power or possession of them in infancy,' I add, 'and  
' in this matter our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration.'  
What does our trickster do, but cut off the words, 'and in this  
' matter,' that he might make the rest of the sentence serve any  
matter, and affix it at the tail of a sentence of his own, and quote  
me for it! And he does the same thing over again in the same page,  
(p. 245.)

Here he would take an advantage from something said by Dr. Whitby; for an answer to which, let him apply to him, if he please.

As for what else may be necessary in answer to this *Socinian* argument against the general use of baptism among Christians, because the Jews did not use it generally, but only to new converts and their children; I refer to what I said above to Mr. Emlyn, who (though managing it cordially for their interest, whereas this man treats it as absurd) yet scorned such unfair and imposturous ways of arguing.

But here Mr. Gale adds, that if we follow the Jews in baptizing infants, we might with as good reason give infants the Lord's Supper; for they caused them to eat of the paschal lamb.

I know not whether that matter of fact be true. And I think Mr. Stokes has given a sufficient answer to that, 'Compassionate  
' Plea,' p. 30, 31.

Page 246, he would prove that St. John Baptist baptized no infants. He brings from Scripture no proofs but what have been answered a hundred times. Such places of Scripture history, as do in a brief and general way give account in a few lines of the substance of what St. John did in several years, cannot be supposed to descend to particular circumstances. Multitudes came in, and were baptized, confessing their sins. What children they brought with them need not be mentioned; especially to the *Jewish* Christians, (and to them St. Matthew wrote,) who knew the custom of their nation to bring their children with them into covenant. If St. John had been sent to convert and *circumcise* any uncircumcised nation; so short an account of his success would hardly have had any mention of the children; and yet no man would have doubted of there being some among them. Mr. Gale would have the expression of St. Matthew to be, 'As many as he baptized confessed their sins.' But that is to serve a cause.

And so Acts xix. 4, which he quotes,

Page 247, *John baptized with the baptism of repentance*, is, as Mr. Stokes observes, no more than what is said of circumcision, Rom. iv. 11, that it is a *seal of the righteousness of faith*. Yet every one knows that it does not exclude infants, who are at present as incapable of *faith* as they are of *repentance*.

The places which he here cites of Josephus and Origen are yet less to the purpose, there being nothing in them from which one can guess that they had at the writing of them any thought at all, *pro* or *contra*, about any children being there; they do only observe, that it was necessary for the adult that came, to confess their sins and amend their lives. At last,

Page 247, he brings the objection, which I had recited of Mr. Stennet; that if the *Jews* had such a custom of baptizing proselytes and their children, it must have been an invention of their own, being not commanded in the law of God.

To that I gave two answers. Mr. Gale takes notice only of the first; that they quoted, as we see, texts of Scripture, such as I there mentioned. He says, [p. 248,] ‘What then?—They may cite the ‘whole Bible, though not a word in it makes for them.’ And a few more such huffing expressions; but nothing to overthrow the interpretations they gave.

I answered, *secondly*; putting the case, that they mistook the sense of those texts; yet when they had upon that authority established a practice of baptizing proselytes and their children; and that practice had now continued many ages: if our Saviour had meant that the apostles, in baptizing proselytes of the nations, should have altered that practice, and denied baptism to the children of such proselytes as they baptized; we have all the reason in the world to think that he would have forewarned them of it. And I instanced in a like case that might have been put, if the nations had been required to keep the feasts, among which was the feast of dedication; not commanded by God, and yet kept for many ages, and observed by Christ himself.

To this Mr. Gale replies nothing at all; (though every antipædobaptist, who is convinced that they had such a custom, must be moved by it; to see that our Saviour, who must know of the custom, gives no caution against it;) but he only runs out to the end of the chapter in an account (not at all to the purpose here) of the distinction of several sorts of traditions of the Jews; how some were more firmly grounded than others. Whereas our main question is of the matter of fact, whether there were such a custom or not.



The most trifling of all is his attempt to evade the force of that passage in the *Talmud*, *Jeremoth*, cap. iv. concerning the dispute between rabbi Eliezer and rabbi Joshua, (of which I thought I had said enough in my *Introduction* to hinder any one's running into the same paralogism.) He says,

Page 249, since those rabbins 'controvert the baptism of proselytes, it cannot be thought a tradition from Moses,' &c. Now he need but open his eyes to see, that they do not controvert the duty of such a baptism; no more than the duty of circumcision; but only the question, Whether one of these, and which of them, may denominate a man a proselyte, if the other of them be by some chance missing?

And the same oversight was at his p. 248, where he takes baptism (and he might as well have proved circumcision) to be established on the pronouncing of the wise men. Whereas it is only the determination of the foresaid question, which they found upon that.

The bragging conclusion, p. 251, I would not have the reader overlook; nor would Mr. Gale, I suppose; because he is careful constantly to use it, so that one might know any book of his by it.

## CHAP. XI.

HERE begins (that with which his book should have begun, if he had meant it an answer to mine) his ventilation of the passages which I brought of the *Fathers* or ancient Christians. He at first spends two or three leaves in talking backward and forward about the regard which ought to be given to the *Fathers*, concerning which he thinks it worth the reader's while to know his opinion. I think not: partly for other reasons; and partly, because one part of it destroys the other. The chapter itself begins at

Page 257, with a malevolent and ungrateful accusation of my performance in collecting their sayings; as if I had set down those which are (as he styles it) *for* my purpose; and omitted those *against* infant-baptism.

I made a profession that that collection should be impartial. And if it be valuable for any thing, it is for that. As it had been an ill thing in me to break that promise; so it is a base thing, if I have not, to accuse me falsely of doing so. I have received the acknowledgment of several readers, both of the impartiality used in collecting, and of the civil treatment of the antipædobaptists. But the talent of some writers consists in railing.

One thing is visible to every body ; that I have produced several quotations, making for their side of the question, which none of their writers had found or knew of. On the other side, it is possible that some might escape me : I never pretended otherwise. Yet so it has happened, that none since, that I know of, have been produced, (and particularly none by Mr. Gale ; which is a poor thing in an antagonist,) except such as I spoke of in the beginning of my second part, and gave the reasons for my omitting them, viz. such as are either spurious, too late, nothing to the purpose, or, &c., under which last sort, of those nothing to the purpose, I comprehended all such as do speak of the baptism of adult persons, (which every body acknowledges was common at the planting of Christianity,) but without any note of denying it to infants.

Now whatever may be said of others, these two out of *Barnabas*, which he here brings as omitted by me, and making against infant-baptism, are plainly not at all to the purpose.

And the first of them is one, which I did quote at large ; and I was the first, that I knew of, that discovered it to relate at all to baptism ; not to the question of infant-baptism ; but to that ceremony of giving a taste of milk and honey to the new baptized person, whether infant or adult. It is recited, (much fuller than he recites it,) in my part ii. chap. 9. § 6. (so shameless is he for charging me with omitting it, even if it had been to his purpose,) he takes a scrap of the end of my quotation, and puts it among his authorities. It proves nothing but the foresaid ceremony.

The second does indeed speak of the baptism of adult persons, (to which purpose he might have produced a hundred in a day's time,) as if any one did not know that multitudes of new converts were at that time baptized ; and that their baptism is more often, and more largely spoken of, than that of their children. Against which baptism of their children there is nothing in this, nor in any other passage of *Barnabas*.

The first two chapters of my book have (as I declared in the preface) no quotations that speak *expressly* of infant-baptism : but of original sin, as it affects infants ; of the necessity of baptism to salvation ; of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c. The first two, which I bring from Clemens Romanus, to shew how fully he owns original sin, or pollution in infants, are not, he says, at

Page 257, 'plain to prove that.' And in the first of them, he says, 'Clemens *says* nothing of it, nor seems to have had the least 'thought of it.' Let any one read it ; and particularly these words in it ; 'there is none free from pollution ; no, not though his

‘life be but of the length of one day;’ and judge of this man’s face.

The other, which speaks of the woful state in which ‘we came ‘into this world,’ cannot, he says, be meant of original sin; because Clement in the next words gives God thanks, which thanks are intended by Clement for our deliverance from that woful state. Which inference could not be made but by a man of great reach and judgment.

Page 257, 258, he gives us his own arguments and sentiments of the point of original sin. Which they that have an opinion of his skill in divinity may do well to read. The most observable thing in them is, the cunning to ingratiate himself with his neighbour antipædobaptists, many of whom deny it; and yet not displease the others who hold it, which are the far major part. And therefore he says, ‘baptism is not *so much* intended for the remission of original, ‘as of actual sins.’ This is mincing. What follows shews his meaning to be, that it is not for the former at all.

Page 259, &c. On that vision of *Hermas*; where the tower, that is to say, the church, is built upon the water; and the explication given, ‘because your life is saved by water:’ he grants that the church triumphant is there built out of the church militant; and the church militant is indeed built on the water of baptism; and yet says, that *Hermas* does nowhere suppose that none can *be saved* who are not members of the church militant. Which any one of common sense (whether they have been at a private academy or not) does perceive to be ‘the denying the conclusion.’ For what is the *church triumphant*, but the number of those that *are saved*?

But he objects, that the stones of which the church (or tower in that vision) is built, are only adult persons; which he proves by an induction of the particular sorts of stones there mentioned; and adds, at p. 261, that I have no ground to assert that my inference will more plainly appear from the next passage which I cite from *Hermas*, lib. iii. Simil. 9, which is nothing but a fuller and larger explication of this vision here; and in which what is here represented by sorts of stones, is there represented by so many sorts of hills out of which the stones are dug.

Now I say, that in that larger explication *infants* are particularly mentioned; (as I had quoted;) for in one of those hills, and in the best of them, the twelfth, called there *the White Hill*, it is said of that hill; ‘they are all as infants, *and are better than any sort before mentioned*: for all that continue as infants without malice shall be ‘more honoured, &c. For all infants are valued by the Lord, and

‘esteemed the first of all.’ Now if we remember what he said before; ‘the church of those which are saved is built on water;’ and, ‘before any one receives the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death; but when he receives that seal, he is——assigned to life. Now that seal is water;’ meaning the water of baptism in the name of Christ;—and subjoin to it what he says here of infants; this enforces a conclusion, that *infants* (since they are of those that are most capable of God’s kingdom) should have this seal given them.

And whereas he would impute to us the harshness of that conclusion; that if it be so, no infant, or other, that dies unbaptized, can be saved; he knows, if he would own it, that we are farther from determining absolutely cases of that nature than he and his partners are. We look on these rules of Hermas, or the like of St. John iii. 5, to be obliging to us, and directions for our practice, without pretending to determine what allowances God will make, either to heathen men and their infants, or in the cases of Christians and their infants, which are extraordinary.

I said, that this declaration in Hermas, ‘that the seal of the Son of God is necessary for all that do enter into the kingdom;’ and that ‘that seal is water;’ is an expression of that definition of our Saviour which St. John did afterwards put into writing, John iii. 5, *Except any one be born of water, &c.* Upon which he grounds this immodest cavil, p. 262, that I seem to import that St. John copied these words from Hermas.

It can seem so to nobody but to him. Nay I believe it did not seem so to him; but only he had a mind to catch at an occasion of reproach. My words import no more, than that our Saviour having given such a rule, the Christians of Hermas’ time must needs know it; and Hermas (or the angel, if it were a proper revelation) might express the substance of it, before St. John had in his Gospel set down the words themselves.

Page 262, he says he will take this occasion to *examine* a little those words of our Saviour, John iii. 5; and gives his reason, because I, as well as the other paedobaptists, do ‘here and elsewhere argue from them;’ and he spends fourteen pages upon it. And, as if he had forgot whose words they are, his way of *examining* them is in a much like indecent manner as he uses in examining the words of any antagonist that he had a mind to overthrow.

But before he began, should he not have heard the voice of his conscience saying to him; If you do set yourself to answer this, and his other proofs from Scripture, you ought to blot out all your sixth



chapter, wherein you broadly said, that he brings no proofs at all from Scripture; nay, that ‘he owns there are none.’ Else your readers comparing the one with the other will perceive the falsehood! But he ventures that. And at

Page 263, first labours to defend the late bishop of Salisbury’s notion; that by *the kingdom of God* in that text is meant, not heaven, but the church on earth; and by some flattering eulogiums of his lordship’s ‘unanswerable arguings,’ &c., seems to have aimed at currying favour. And whereas I had said that all the ancients understand it in this place of *the kingdom of glory*; he says, ‘yet it ‘may not be the true sense, if they do. For the ancients were ‘fallible,’ &c. It seems he can find no *unanswerable arguments* among them. For they were all dead, and had no places to give.

Page 263, he says, the authorities I make use of, to prove the ancient interpretation to be *the kingdom of glory*, are ‘all too late, ‘and of those centuries wherein pædobaptism prevailed. If I had ‘cited the writers of the first three centuries, it had been considerable.’

To cite any writers of any centuries wherein pædobaptism did not prevail, is more than I can do. But if those of the first three centuries will satisfy him, I refer him to my second edition, part ii. chap. 6. § 1. (which he must have seen; or else he is a very careless answerer of a book :) I shall not transcribe here the reasons and authorities which I there give. He will see there Hermas in the apostles’ time, and Tertullian a hundred years after, cited; beside others referred to. To which references may be added the explication of this text, given by Nemesianus in his suffrage delivered in the council of Carthage under St. Cyprian. He expounds it; *Salvi esse non possunt: sed in judicio Christi damnabuntur*. After all, I do not see (as I there said) what the antipædobaptists gain by the other interpretation; nor would I eagerly contend with any one that takes the words here to mean *the church*. I own, they are in many places of the gospel so taken.

Page 264, he begins a new dispute about the comprehensiveness of the particle *τις* in this text, (which he had yielded at p. 262,) and proves from Thucydides, &c., that *τις* does not signify *every*. But in the next page, after much belabouring himself, he recollects, (a thing which any boy could have told him at first,) that though in an affirmative proposition *τις* does not signify *all* or *every*, yet in a negative one, *ἐὰν μὴ τις* signifies *not any*, or *none*; so that our Saviour’s words amount to this, *none but those born of water, &c., can enter*.

Page 265, he is at last forced to run to the same kind of answer to this text as Mr. Emlyn before had used, viz. that though ἐὰν μὴ τίς do in words make a general negative, yet it must be restrained to the subjects there spoken of. Which Mr. Emlyn would have to be, ‘such as are converted from infidelity.’ That fitted his turn best, that our Saviour should say, Except any one of those, that are newly converted from infidelity, be born again, &c., but the descendants of believers may have the kingdom without it. Whereas our Saviour’s words are, *All that is born of the flesh.*

Mr. Emlyn’s guess, as it had but little ground, so he expressed it with brevity and modesty. But here we have a ramble and a wild-goose chase, to find what is meant by *any one*. ‘Any one what?’ says Mr. Gale; ‘any one *being*? any one *angel*? any one *man*? ‘*woman*? *child*?’ (This is his way of *examining* the words of our blessed Saviour, as if he had some sophister, his fellow, to oppose.) At last he fixes it for his own hypothesis, as the other had done for his; ‘any one who is come to the use of his reason, and has heard ‘the word,’ &c. (as if they only were to be admitted to the kingdom of heaven.) ‘And this,’ says he, ‘we assert, is *the only genuine* ‘meaning of our Lord’s words.’

I do not deny but that in many propositions of Scripture, however generally expressed, we must limit the meaning to such subjects as the context does shew to be the only ones there intended; provided those limitations be plainly grounded on the context.

As here. The discourse of our Saviour is plainly concerning human persons already born; because he speaks of the necessity of their being *born again*. And their first birth was *of the flesh*; as he says in the next words.

And they must be such as are in a capacity, or may be brought to, a capacity, of being members of *the kingdom of God*; for the main discourse is about bringing them thither.

And such as are in a capacity to be baptized with water (which our Saviour here expresses, *born of water*), and by the mercy of God put into a new spiritual state by the virtue and influence of the Holy Spirit (which he here expresses, *born of the Spirit*).

These qualifications are spoken of in the context, and no other: none concerning the age of the person, nor any concerning the state of his parents, heathen or Christian.

Therefore the words of Christ being universal for all such; the *Socinians*, unless they can maintain that one descended of Christian parents is not at first *born of the flesh*, must not make limitations of

their own, but must (if they would have the person come to the kingdom) bring him, as well as they would a converted heathen, to this *new birth of water and of the Spirit*.

And so the antipædobaptists,—if they do confess that their children are *born of the flesh*; and yet do wish, pray, and hope, that being dedicated to Christ, they shall come to *the kingdom of God*; and cannot deny but a child is capable of being washed *with water*; nor will deny (but on the contrary hope) that their child is capable of having the benefits of Christ's covenant sealed and applied to him by *the Spirit of God*;—must not make limitations of their own to this universal law and command of Christ; which requires this *new birth of water and of the Spirit* in order to their entering God's kingdom; and makes no exception or distinction of infant or adult; but allows to both of them an admission into his kingdom.

Of these qualifications mentioned, the only one of which they can make any doubt is, how an infant can be *born of the Spirit*. Of this I had given the sense of the ancient Christians, part i. chap. 15. § 8, and also in the explication and enforcement of this text, part ii. chap. 6. § 1. and shewed that the antipædobaptists do own that the Spirit of Christ is applied to infants, and unites them to him; and quoted the words of Mr. Tombes and of Mr. Danvers.

Mr. Gale, at p. 271, recites some of my words; does not offer to deny that 'the Holy Spirit does seal and apply pardon of sin, and 'other promises of the covenant, to the infant;' but only mentions some other offices of the Holy Spirit in the adult, over and besides those which infants are capable of.

Now that does not hinder but that an infant may be *born again of the Spirit*, by those operations of the Spirit of which his state is then capable; though he have not at present some farther graces of the Spirit, of which the adult only are capable; of which those particular texts cited by Mr. Gale do speak.

In this rule of our Saviour, pronounced so solemnly, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except any one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*; Mr. Emlyn adds, of his own head, and without any ground from the text, 'A heathen converted cannot, 'nor can his children: but a man or child *born of Christian parents* 'may.' And Mr. Gale, with no better ground than the other, is fain to add to Christ's words, and make them run thus; no *adult* person can; but a child may.

The reasons he gives, why this rule cannot concern infants, are these:

Page 265. First, they do not know this law ; therefore it cannot oblige them.

Just what might have been said of the infants of the Jews. They did not know the law of circumcision ; yet God Almighty told their parents, that those of their children whom they refused or neglected to circumcise should be cut off. A benefactor who promises to adopt a poor man's child, and make him his heir, if he will give up his child to him, is not bound to do it if the parent refuse. Christ promises the kingdom of heaven to our children, if we will dedicate them to him in the sacrament of dedication which he has appointed. He does not promise it, if we refuse. It is not a thing due to them by nature. This benefit, or this loss, concerns the child, although at that time he know it not.

Page 266. He makes his second reason by confronting a saying of St. Peter to this of Christ : 1 Pet. iii. 21, *Baptism saith us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.*

Mr. Stokes serves him in his kind. He bids him do with this text as he did with John iii. 5, put in the word 'adult' here, as he did there.

Dr. Whitby had given a better answer to their argument from hence. That St. Paul, Rom. ii. 28, 29, says of circumcision the same thing in effect that St. Peter does here of baptism ; that the true circumcision *is not that which is outward in the flesh, but the inward circumcision of the heart and spirit* ; and yet none will argue from thence that circumcision should not be given to infants, who could not at that time have the circumcision of the heart.

Mr. Gale labours to shew a difference ; but in vain, as any one will see ; the aim of St. Paul being to inculcate this ; that any one's circumcision which he had received in infancy would not avail him, if, after he grew up, he did not circumcise his heart, and keep the covenant which circumcision had sealed to him. And St. Peter's words running in the same style are plainly capable of the same sense, that baptism received in infancy would not save the man, who did not, after he came to age, with a good conscience make good the engagements of the Christian religion, into which he had been by it entered. Therefore as St. Paul's words cannot be made an argument to prove that circumcision was not then received in infancy, (it being notorious that it was,) no more can St. Peter's words argue, that baptism was not then given in infancy by the Christians to such children as they had.

Nay, further, if St. Paul do so speak of circumcision, which was



then administered to infants only, and had been by himself received in infancy; much more might St. Peter so speak of baptism, which at that time had more subjects which had received it at their adult age, than they were who had received it in infancy; (and St. Peter himself was one of them;) and yet not imply any denial of the benefit of it to the children of Christians, provided they did, when they came to age, perform the duties of it.

And this comparison and parallelism of St. Paul's words about circumcision with those of St. Peter about baptism, does not only take off the objections of the antipædobaptists raised from this text of St. Peter; but all that they raise from other texts, where baptism, and the following duties and effects of it, are put together in the same sentence. Such as Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, *Baptize, &c., teaching them, &c.*: Rom. vi. 4, *Buried with him in baptism, &c.: that we should walk, &c.*: and at other places; *the baptism of repentance*, and the like.

For as when St. Paul says here, *Circumcision profiteth, if thou keep the law*: and a little after speaks of such as *by the letter and circumcision do transgress the law*; he does not, though he join them in one sentence, mean that *at the same time* when they were circumcised, they did either *keep* or *transgress* the law; but only that as they grew up, they did some of them keep, some of them transgress. So the forecited texts, and such other, though they join them together in one sentence, do not necessarily imply that *at the same time* they were *baptized* and *taught*; *baptized* and *walked in newness of life*; *baptized* and *repented*; but that, as they grew up, they had these consequences of teaching, walking, repenting, &c.

Such expressions would fit, not only those that had been baptized when adult, (as most of the Christians in the apostles' time had,) but (as we see by St. Paul's speaking in just the same phrase concerning circumcision) those who had received baptism in infancy.

Mr. Gale pleads that the cases of St. Peter's and St. Paul's discourse are not parallel. First, because St. Paul does not say of circumcision, (as St. Peter does of baptism,) *Not this* has the good effect; *but the other*. Which is broadly to deny St. Paul to say that which he plainly does say.

Secondly, because St. Paul does not speak this of circumcision while it continued in force; but now it was abolished.

But (as Mr. Stokes well answers) the Jewish Christians (to whom St. Paul here speaks) did even then use it, and reckon it to be still in force as to Jews, though not to Gentiles, Acts xxi. 20, &c.

And St. Paul says here, *Circumcision profiteth if thou keep the law*. By which it appears that his argument to them is, *ad hominem*;

supposing, and speaking to them of it, as it was when it was in full force.

And besides; what St. Paul here says, is in effect the same with what is said, Deut. x. 16, and xxx. 6, Jer. iv. 4, when it was in full force.

Page 268. His third exception against my arguing from this text is that trite one; that our Saviour, John vi. 53, makes the same necessity of *eating his flesh, and drinking his blood*, as in John iii. 5, he does of being baptized. Therefore since it is confessed that that eating and drinking (whether it be understood of the sacramental eating, or of faith in Christ) does not belong to infants; we should by the same reason account them to be excepted in the other command of baptism.

This has been answered a hundred times. That all commands of God or man (how general soever the words are) are to be understood as meant and directed to such only as are capable of the thing commanded. Mr. Gale often urges this rule. I said, we do not deny it. The command of actual faith (which he thinks is the meaning of eating in John vi,) is plainly impossible to infants; but their baptism, their being dedicated to Christ, is not at all. The command to all *Jews* to worship, offer sacrifice, &c., did by the nature of the thing concern only the adult. The command that all males be circumcised, concerned all without exception, infants as well as adult; because of that they were capable. So in the case of these texts. Infants being excepted in the application of the command, John vi, of which they are (if actual faith be there meant) as yet in no wise capable, is no argument that they should be excluded from the benefit of John iii. 5, of which they are capable.

Neither do the expressions of our Saviour run alike in both the places. That of John vi. was spoken to persons that could hear and be admonished; *Except ye eat, &c.*, and can concern only such. That of John iii, is a general definition of the state of all persons born of the flesh; *Except any one be born again*. Baptism is the sacrament of initiation, or entering into covenant; and of that infants are capable. And whereas Mr. Gale in the next pages brings more instances of things of which infants are not capable; Mark xvi. 16, *He that believeth not shall be damned*; John iii. 18, *He that believeth not is condemned already*; where infants cannot by the nature of the thing be meant; they avail him nothing toward a proof that they are not meant here.

Page 269. He will needs give us his opinion, what God will do

in reference to the eternal state of those adult among the heathens who have neither faith nor baptism. In which matters so far out of human reach, the more forward any one is to obtrude his opinion, the less it is to be regarded. This however he gives but as an opinion, 'We have great reason to hope,' &c. But concerning the eternal state of *infants*, dying unbaptized, (as he would have all that die in infancy to do,) he is more positive, and talks with as much assurance of the decrees of God, as any confident man can do of matters of his trade, or any mountebank of his skill in receipts; so that no pope with St. Peter's keys in his hand can more peremptorily dispose of places in the kingdom of heaven. For,

Page 269, he makes that his fourth reason against the baptizing of infants in order to their admission into heaven, that 'all infants' (meaning, as his words shew, baptized or not, of heathen or of Christian parents, of the wicked as well as of the godly) 'shall assuredly be saved.'

If modesty be necessary anywhere, it is when we speak of the future judgments of God in cases not revealed. Godly parents in all ages have been solicitous for the salvation of their children; and inasmuch as they have been under God the authors of their being; nature itself, as well as God's word, has strongly inclined them to wish, pray, and endeavour that that being might become a happy and advantageous, and not a miserable being to them. And accordingly have been careful to use any means prescribed by God Almighty for that purpose.

The godly Jews, to make use of that seal of circumcision to enter them into God's gracious covenant, whereby he had promised them *to be a God to them and their seed*; to use their own prayers; and to bring them to any prophet or holy man, and desire him to bless them in the name of God, &c. The godly Christians, to bring them to Christ to be dedicated to him and the Father and Holy Spirit, to be baptized in that holy name, for the forgiveness and washing off that stain and pollution which is by corrupt nature, in which they were conceived and born; to implore the mercy of God to receive and admit them into that his merciful covenant made to mankind, by which he will *for Christ's sake, and to all that are his*, give an eternal life, which is a greater and higher advantage than could naturally be expected for them; and to desire that in order to obtain this inestimable benefit, there be used, beside their own prayers, the prayers and offices of Christ's minister, and of his church.

Now this man would have nothing of this to be done; but says in effect, it is more than needs. The child without all this is as

safe as with it; and after all this the child of an atheist, who regards not Christ or his covenant, or any prayer to him, or sacrament of his, is as safe as this child.

If you inquire for the ground of this strange assurance, you have his dictate; ‘If there be any mercy in God,—all infants, who ‘could never offend him, shall assuredly be saved.’ And by *being saved*, he does not mean only, (as some of the *Greek* church did, and as the *Roman* does now,) that unbaptized infants, and heathen men’s infants, shall be in a state of little or no punishment or suffering; but he means, (as appears by his other words,) shall have *the kingdom of heaven*. And this without inserting any thing of Christ’s mediation and death as the meritorious cause of their salvation; but so pleads their cause at this place, as if they needed it not. Let him therefore be the man to answer the challenge which St. Austin fourteen hundred years ago made to any impious person, who, when infants were brought to church to be baptized, should ‘dare to ‘affirm that they may be saved without that regeneration, as if ‘Christ had not died for them; for it was sinners that he died for,’ &c.——and to say, (as he there sets him a form,) ‘Carry back ‘from hence these innocent creatures; *the whole have no need of a ‘physician, but they that are sick. Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners.*’ St. Austin thought there would never be any Christian presumptuous enough to accept this challenge. He says there; *De peccat. meritis*, lib. i. c. 18. ‘Such a thing never was said, ‘nor ever will be said, in the church of Christ.’ There was never a Mr. Gale at that time, and he thought never would be.

But thou, Christian reader, if thou hast children, especially such as are in danger of death; and hast that pious concern for their everlasting welfare, and for their obtaining that heavenly purchase of Christ, even *eternal life*, which every good parent ought to have: depend not on any such mountebank assurances, or arrogant dictates of men that make so bold with God’s judgments, as if they themselves were judges; but humbly apply to Christ himself, (who has procured this wonderful favour,) and to his word; and seek for such assurances for thy child’s soul as are grounded on that, and not on men’s bold reasonings; use earnest prayers to God in the name of *Christ*, that for *his sake* (and not merely because it has never actually offended him) it may be received into those everlasting habitations which he has prepared for all that are *his*, and for none else: do not conceive of heaven as of a place *due* to human nature, though it could be conceived innocent; much less in the



corrupt state that it is now in. Remember what David says of our natural birth, Psalm li. 5.

Pray particularly that God would not remember thy sins, or the sins of its other forefathers; but that its soul may be washed from illa pollution in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, which only can make a soul pure enough to be received into the place that was purchased by it. Read that record of God, 1 John v. 11, 12, *That God hath given to us an eternal life; and this life is in (or by) his Son. He that hath the Son (or has an interest in the Son) hath this life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.* No man will, or dare, say, infants shall be excepted in that sentence which requires that they be in Christ, or *have Christ* for their Saviour: nor can give any good proof that they shall be excepted in this before us. For which way come they to *belong to Christ*, or to *have him*, but as they are dedicated and entered into his covenant in the way that he has appointed for all whom he will save, to be entered?

Read that godly saying of the pious and judicious Mr. Hooker, (which I recited, part ii. chap. 6. § 1.) in his Eceles. Polity, lib. v. 59, 60. 'If Christ himself, which giveth salvation, do require 'baptism; it is not for us that look for salvation to sound and 'examine him, whether unbaptized men may be saved: but seriously to do that which is required,' &c. The words of Christ are general; *Except any one.* And Matt. xxviii; *All nations.* He does nowhere except infants.

Mr. Gale says, 'They never could offend him.' No more could the brute creatures. Shall they therefore go to heaven? But he will say, these are of *human* race. Has human race any *claim* to heaven? It is the peculiar purchase of our blessed Saviour for all those of human race that are *his*. He procured it, and has granted a possibility and promise of it to mankind under certain limitations and conditions (without excepting infants), one of which conditions is this of the text.

He says, if it be so, then 'millions of infants will not be saved.' And he had made before the like objection concerning all the heathen world, the adult heathens.

To all which sort of bold inquiries we can return only this; Christ has told *us*, to whom his word is come, what *we ourselves* are to expect. Concerning those to whom it never came, whoever busily inquires of him, *And what shall these men do?* or, What shall become of them? does in effect receive from him this answer; *What is that to thee?* He has said in general; *The servant that knew not*

*his master's will, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes.* And more than that he has not told us of their fate; and of their children nothing at all. He will, we need not fear, deal with all men, adult and infant, according to rules of justice and equity. But if a man, a worm, will not trust him with the ordering of those rules; but will demand beforehand, what he will do with such, and what with such; *He giveth not account of any of his matters.* A modest and humble speculation about such things may be useful, or however excusable. But to talk and determine after this arrogant rate; 'If there be any mercy in him,' he will do so with these, and so with those, is good for nothing, but to create in us an abhorrence of the bold presumption of the determiner.

He says, 'Infinite mercy cannot make the happiness of any of his creatures to depend upon conditions that were impossible for them to perform.'

As for any happiness that was *due* to them, this may indeed be a rule. But the kingdom of heaven is not *due* to all his creatures. And where it is not *due*, he may do what he will with is own; and set what conditions he thinks fit. And as for this condition of receiving baptism in his name, he may well say to any parent, If you will dedicate yourself to me by baptism, and live accordingly, you shall be admitted to that happiness; and so shall your children, if you will dedicate them, and they do not afterward by their own rebellion forfeit it.

This condition, Mr. Gale says, is *impossible* for the child to perform. True; if he has an antipædobaptist parent, or a heathen parent, or a very careless Christian parent. But even in that case, the child (suppose he do miss of the kingdom of heaven; as all the ancient Christians, when they expound this text, do think he will) does not lose any happiness that was *due* to him. And for other children, whose parents or sponsors desire baptism for them, and it becomes impossible by reason of sudden death, or other accident; it is the hope of most protestants that God does in such case accept of the *will* for the *deed*, and give them the kingdom of heaven; because here was the heart and purpose to do what God commanded.

In short, this arrogant rule, as he lays it down, strikes at God's justice in the case of circumcision, as well as of pædobaptism; and with the same assurance as he here tells us, our explication of this text supposes a thing which God cannot do, he may, upon hearing Gen. xvii. 14, say, That is what God could not do. For circumcision was as impossible for the child to perform, as baptism is; and yet without it he was cut off.

It is worth the while to observe how strongly, and with what sinews, this argument, which determines so positively concerning what God can, or cannot do, is built.

Our Saviour's rule, *Except any one, &c.*, cannot concern infants, proved thus :

Page 270. As it does not concern angels, who, 'we are sure,' shall, though not baptized, enter, &c., so it does not concern infants, who, 'we may reasonably suppose,' shall, whether baptized or not, all of them enter, &c.

This was as yet lame ; because between 'we are sure' and 'we may 'reasonably suppose' there is some difference. Therefore within three lines it is mended ; and instead of 'we may reasonably suppose,' it is put 'shall assuredly.' That does it. Only there is this difference ; the angels are there already ; but that unbaptized infants, such as their parents refuse to enter into Christ's church here, shall enter there, we have no other proof than this man's 'shall assuredly ;' and his giving a rule to God Almighty's power in the following words ; 'God our Saviour cannot ordain 'such unreasonable laws.'

He brings at last another argument. In Mark x. 14, Christ, speaking of infants, says, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven.*

Why did not he quote all the text ; *Suffer them to come to me : for of such, &c.* ? Lest we should understand it thus : Infants are capable of being members of the kingdom of heaven : therefore bring them to me, and do not forbid them for their infancy. Whereas he would have us expound it, (quite contrary to our Saviour's inference,) *Of such is the kingdom of heaven ;* therefore bring them not to me ; they need it not.

Page 270, comes his last exception against our argument from the foresaid text of John iii. 5, that our Saviour there requires their being 'born of the Spirit, as well as of water ;' which cannot be meant of infants.

To which I gave answer twice or thrice in the book he is answering. And here above, once to Mr. Bernard, once to Mr. Emlyn, and once or twice to Mr. Gale. What I there shew that the antipædobaptists confess of the gracious offices of the Holy Spirit in the case of infants ; Danvers says, 'Who doubts 'it ? I am sure I never affirmed the contrary.' And if our author will deny it, let him speak out.

Instead of that, he recites some texts where are mentioned several other operations of the Spirit, (which are indeed peculiar to the adult,) but says nothing to overthrow what I had said ; that

the Holy Spirit, beside his office of converting the heart, &c., does also 'apply pardon of sin, and other promises of the covenant,' of which an infant is capable.

Where he says, p. 271, that I take this for *all* that is meant in the text by *born of the Spirit*; I answer, that that cannot be said to be *all*. Because the words being general, of *any one's* being *born of the Spirit*, and applicable to the baptism both of an adult person and of an infant; there may be several other effects and operations of the Spirit on the heart of an adult, beside those that are common to the adult and infants.

And whereas he quotes Dr. Whitby, who would not have an infant's case comprehended in this text; Dr. Whitby, when he animadverts that the church in the office of baptism does directly quote and apply these very words of our Saviour to the baptism of every infant, will not deny that they are applicable to it.

Now at last he returns to what I quoted from *Hermas*; and,

Page 272, excepts against any inference for paedobaptism that can be drawn from that part of the vision, where the patriarchs and other holy men, that had died before the Christian baptism was instituted, are represented as baptized by the apostles in the separate state.

I owned that it does not speak directly of infants; and all that I pretended to conclude from it was, the necessity of water-baptism to salvation, or to entrance into the kingdom of God, in the opinion of the then Christians, i. e. the Christians of the apostles' time. Those are my words.

He says, I concluded; 'therefore the church of that time practised the baptism of infants.' I did not say that. But left it to the reader to judge, how far it would follow from the necessity of baptism to *all* that do enter; since the patriarchs themselves could not enter without it. Therefore I need say nothing to those three pages, wherein he talks of want of connexion, &c., as if I had made a syllogism of it; or parables not being argumentative, not running on all four; and such pedantic stuff.

He says, those patriarchs had been adult, and had had actual sins in their former life; and for them might need baptism. He should have minded that *Hermas* (or the angel) does not make that the reason; but says, 'they died in great purity; only this seal was wanting to them.' He concludes this head at

Page 274, with a merry scoff; if this 'proves any thing in favour of infant-baptism, it is only, that they shall be baptized in the other world. But be this as it will: it is sufficient that they are not to be baptized here; which is all we insist on.'



If the schism can be supported, and hold up its head, till that time, he is indifferent what becomes of the question itself. And if he 'gain his point' here, let who will gain it there. But it is bad venturing this, lest those, whose parents refused for them here, be refused there. It was granted to those patriarchs there; because it had not been instituted here during the time of their mortal life.

Page 274, 275. Here he first would willingly deny that by the word *infants*, in a passage of *Hermas* there recited, are meant infants in age. Which evasion the mere reading of the place does plainly confute. So not insisting on that, but saying with his usual modesty, 'perhaps it may be so;' he pleads still, that that declaration of God's compassionate love to infants, 'all infants are valued by the Lord,' &c., does not signify any thing to their baptism; for that there is no necessary connexion between God's love and baptism.

There is, as we have seen, a connexion made by our Saviour between admission into his kingdom, and baptism. And we think admission into his kingdom to be an effect of, and connected to, his love.

He observes that the words are, 'All infants;' which he paraphrases; 'All upon the same level, merely as infants, baptized, or 'not.' Forgetting that *Hermas* had said before, that all who enter must have 'that seal, and that seal is water.' And our Saviour before him had spoke to the same purpose.

He says, *Hermas* calls infants *innocent*. So does the church of England in the Office of Baptism; where yet it owns their being conceived in sin. It means only, innocent in comparison; of a meek temper, &c.

He says it is strange that *Hermas*, in his representations of the several materials of which the church was built, should never give infants one place, but constantly neglect them.

And yet this very place that we are upon is a mention of them in that 'white mountain,' which was the chief of all that afforded any stones to the building.

Page 275. To prove that *Hermas* had no notion of infant-baptism, he quotes an exhortation of his, that is, as he thinks, inconsistent with it; 'I say unto you all, whoever have received 'this seal; Keep simplicity,' &c.

This is your man for 'connexion' in an argument. Though such an exhortation be (as Mr. Stokes also observes) but the same that any pædobaptist preacher does commonly use to his people; yet he (lest the reader should take the inference from it against pædobap-

tism to be shamefully weak and trifling) with his usual countenance tells us ; ‘ It is not possible any inference should be more direct and ‘ necessary.’

I had observed that this saying of Hermas, ‘ All infants are valued ‘ by the Lord,’ is to the same effect as our Saviour’s embracing infants, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God.* Mr. Gale says, that I supposed this a plain argument for their baptism.

I have not that lucky talent (in which he does so excel) of cramming down the reader’s throat inferences from any premises. What I said was, that it is ‘ one of the reasons used to prove ‘ that they are fit to be admitted into the covenant of God’s grace ‘ and love by baptism.’ And I do still think it a stronger one than any the antipædobaptists can bring for the negative ; and such as they do not give any solid answer to.

But he says, I did not reason from the words, (and indeed it was not the province that I had undertaken,) but only *cite* them, as if they were plain to the purpose. He therefore undertakes the reasoning part [p. 276]. And his reasons are (such as he is used to), ‘ The pædobaptists do much pervert the place.’ The words ‘ have no relation to baptism at all, nor to any thing necessarily ‘ connected with it.’ ‘ What is there, I beseech you, in the whole ‘ matter, which can make them fasten upon this place?’ And so he goes on ranting and insulting over the pædobaptists (and Dr. Hammond for one) till he comes to Dr. Whitby, whom he never passes by without a compliment ; which here runs thus ; he ‘ is pleased to ‘ improve the passage to the utmost advantage ; and he being in ‘ general so very fair and sincere a writer, and comprehending the ‘ whole substance of what can be urged from the place ; I will examine what he has said.’ And in that examination he begins gently, and forces himself to civil language ; but before he has done, nature returns upon him, and he tells the doctor ; ‘ his argument is ‘ grounded on a mistake ;’ ‘ the doctor gives no reason ;’ ‘ this is ‘ directly begging the question,’ &c.

Now because since that time the doctor has published his wish to see an answer to this book of ‘ the learned, the very learned Mr. Gale’ ; I think it concerns him to answer this part himself. And since he has given up to them the other text of John iii. 5, (which the church of England does not, and the ancient Christians would not have done,) to vindicate at least his own argument from this. For I, though I think it a very easy thing to shew the weakness of

<sup>z</sup> [See above, p. 499, and the note there, describing the tract of Dr. Whitby against Dr. Jo. Edwards, in which these expressions of commendation occur.]

all that is said against it here, had rather for some reasons that he should do it himself. It is certainly more to the purpose to write in his own vindication against this 'very learned man,' than to write against Dr. Snape, in vindication of another 'very learned man<sup>a</sup>.'

Page 278. The exposition of this text given by the late Bishop of Salisbury, (which he here likewise attacks,) may (because he is dead) be here (for want of a better hand) freed from that little which he objects against it. That bishop had, both in the other text and in this, by *the kingdom of God* understood the church here, or, as he styles it, 'the dispensation of the Messiah.' Mr. Gale, who was eager for this sense of the word in the other place, and said, his lordship had 'unanswerably argued' that that is the sense in which *the kingdom of God* does stand *almost universally* through the whole Gospel, is utterly against it here, for a reason of much less weight than was that of St. Austin's, (which I cited,) to prove that not the church on earth, but the kingdom of glory was meant in John iii. 5, which Mr. Gale there called a frivolous one. St. Austin on those words, John iii., *shall not see the kingdom of God*, concluded the kingdom there spoken of to be the kingdom of glory, and not the church here; because of the church here, it cannot be denied but a wicked or unbaptized man might see it. Mr. Gale said that was a frivolous

<sup>a</sup> [Dr. Wall evidently alludes here to the share which Dr. Whitby appears to have taken in that which is well known as 'the Bangorian controversy.'

The commencement of this, and its progress, so far as these parties were concerned, was as follows:

Bishop Hoadly having preached before the king, on the 31st of March, 1717, a sermon on the nature of Christ's church and kingdom, great excitement was the consequence, and the bishop was speedily attacked from various quarters. Some of the earliest publications against him were those of Dr. Andrew Snape: which were replied to by the bishop himself, by Francis de la Pillonniere, a reformed Jesuit whom bishop Hoadly at that time entertained in his house,—by Dr. Whitby, and others.

The following are some of the pieces in question:

1. A Sermon on the Nature of Christ's Church, &c., by Benjamin [Hoadly] Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
2. A letter addressed to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, occasioned by his lordship's sermon, &c., by Andrew Snape, D.D. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
3. An answer to the Rev. Dr. Snape's

letter, &c., by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1717.

4. A second letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, by Andrew Snape, D.D. 4to. *London*, 1717.
5. An answer to the Rev. Dr. Snape's accusation, &c., by Francis de la Pillonniere: with a preface by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
6. An answer to Dr. Snape's second letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, by Dan. Whitby, D.D. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
7. A Vindication of the passage in Dr. Snape's second letter, &c., by the Rev. Dr. Snape. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
8. A reply to Dr. Snape's Vindication, &c., by Fr. de la Pillonniere: to which is prefixed a Letter to Dr. Snape by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1718.
9. A Defence of the propositions contained in the Lord Bishop of Bangor's sermon, &c., by Daniel Whitby, D.D. 8vo. *London*, 1718.
10. A third Defence, containing a reply to Dr. Snape and Mr. Mills' new calumnies, &c., by Francis de la Pillonniere: with some remarks on Dr. Snape's letter; by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1718.

argument. And yet in Mark x. 15, *shall not enter into the kingdom*, he concludes here, it must be the kingdom of glory; for into the church here ‘the greatest villains may be admitted, if they conceal their wickedness.’ If that was frivolous, this is much more so. For in what sense soever a wicked man, or unbaptized person, may enter into the church; much more he may see it.

He ventures farther; and puts the case, suppose *the kingdom of God* do mean *the church*; and (as his supposition must be, if it be pertinent) suppose infants were to be admitted into it; yet ‘how does it appear they were to be admitted by baptism? Baptism is ‘the only way of admitting adult persons, but is nowhere prescribed to infants.’ And then he proposes a method for a new sect; that should admit into their church adult persons by *baptism*, and infants by doing to them as our Lord did to those here mentioned, viz. by *laying on of hands, and prayer*. This, he says, he ‘should rather imagine, if they are to be admitted at all.’

This were certainly better than their present practice of not receiving infants into the church at all. For the *receiving* them some way or other is plainly directed and encouraged by our Saviour, upon an occasion like to this, Matt. xviii.

And whereas Christ at this time is said to have received these by blessing and laying on of hands, without any mention of the baptizing of them; that is no otherwise expressed than it is often in the case of adult persons who came to him to be healed, and who professed their belief in him, and upon whom he sometimes laid his hands; and yet none of them is said at that time to be baptized by him; though none doubts but that they were baptized by his disciples.

If the antipædobaptists be once convinced of their duty of ‘receiving little children in Christ’s name’ by any ceremony at all; they will rather receive them by the sacrament which he has appointed for all that enter, than by this of Mr. Gale’s proposing. However, this ought seriously to be laid to heart by those who will not at all receive one such little child in Christ’s name.

Supposing that the bishop’s interpretation of *the kingdom of heaven* signifying *the church* here, does not hold; but it signifies the kingdom of glory: yet his main argument from these words for the baptizing such infants does continue firm; since by the other text, all that are to be members of that must be baptized.

He brings also against the bishop that argument, that if they be received to baptism, they must also to the Lord’s supper. Which, having been answered over and over, is now grown threadbare.



Page 278, he and his *sir*, having had this imaginary triumph over, not me only, but the said doctor and bishop, do as two cocks here, as at all other conclusions, clap their wings and crow.

---

## CHAP. XII.

MR. GALE, because next to Hermas I pass to Justin Martyr, and so do 'pass over (as he calls it) [p. 280.] half the second 'century without any attempt upon it;' begs that all the space left out by me may be given him. And because the antipædobaptists can bring no evidence at all from these times; if we leave out any author, as having nothing *pro* or *contra* about the age of baptizing; they claim them as being our leavings. Whereas the truth of the matter is, that (if we except Ignatius, who, as he was going to martyrdom, wrote some short letters of his last advice to the neighbouring churches; and Polycarp, who wrote one such short letter) there is never a book of the fifty years, he mentions, left. Of which if Mr. Gale were aware, you may see, he will make a flourish to his ignorant readers of a thing which he knows has nothing in it.

My chapter of quotations out of Justin has not, as I owned in the preface, any *express* mention of infant-baptism; but of original sin, as it affects infants; of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c.

He says, the proof of their holding the doctrine of original sin (and that, beside actual sins, there is in our nature, since the fall, something that needs *redemption and forgiveness* by the merits of Christ) 'concerns not the baptizing of infants.' For, though we do say that that redemption and forgiveness is ordinarily to be applied to every one *by baptism*; that signifies nothing, unless *Justin* say so. Nor is it sufficient to say, the Scripture teaches it; for the question here immediately is not what the Scriptures teach, but what *Justin* teaches.

Now this is very subtle arguing; but (as most of your subtle notions) being a little weighed proves very light. There wants nothing to see through it, but to remember that Justin knew the Scriptures. If they do teach, that original pollution does in order to its forgiveness require baptism, and he knew and believed them; our proving that he held pollution in infants, proves by consequence that he must hold their need of baptism.

To stop this dispute about original sin, he refers to what he had said at his 257th page; where the most that I can make of it is,

that he believes no such thing. And here he questions whether *Justin* and the ancients had any notion of it.

Page 281, he falls foul on my translation of a sentence which I quoted to shew that Father's sense of it, Dial. p. 94. ed. Steph.<sup>b</sup> where it is said that Christ condescended to be *born, and baptized, and crucified*, not being under any necessity or want upon his own account of any of those things; but he did them *ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὄφρεως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου*. Which I translated: 'for mankind, which by Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile of the serpent, beside the particular cause which each man had of sinning.' He says, it ought, he thinks, to be translated thus; 'for mankind, which from (not *by*) Adam was fallen under death and the guile of the serpent, by their own act and deed, every one having done wickedly.'

This were tolerable, even though the mistake be his own; if he did not add to it some of his natural impudence and abusive language. My translation, he says, is 'such as no schoolboy would have made.' Whether 'I did it out of ignorance, or inadvertency, he will not determine.'

The only difference is about *ἀπὸ* and *παρά*. How they are in this place to be rendered. Every one knows that an author speaking of mankind 'fallen under death and the guile of the serpent' *ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ* may be understood either thus; *from* (or *by*) Adam, as the cause or origin of that fall, and death; as I translate. Or thus, 'from the time of Adam,' as Mr. Gale translates. They know likewise that *παρὰ* with an accusative does signify generally *præter, beside*; and sometimes (but very seldom) *propter, by reason of*. And that it is the sense and scope of the place, that must determine how these prepositions must be rendered here.

Now all that I have seen, that have had occasion to take notice of this saying of Justin, and, I believe, absolutely all that did ever translate or interpret it, have understood and rendered it as I did.

Perionius, whose Latin translation of Justin is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Colon. 1618, renders *ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ*, 'Adami opera; by the means (or fault) of Adam.' And *παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκαστοῦ*; 'præter privatam ac propriam uniuscujusque culpam;' 'beside every one's particular and peculiar fault' (or sin). In the Paris edition, 1636, the translation given by Langus is; 'Sed humani generis causa, quod per Adam in mortem, et fraudem seductionemque

<sup>b</sup> [Justin. Dialog. cum Tryphone Judæo, sect. 88. edit. Benedictin.]

‘serpentis considerat : ut interim propriam pro se maligne agentis  
‘eujusque culpam taceam.’

Dr. Hammond having occasion in his Annotations on Psalm li. to quote the former part of this sentence, translates ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ‘by  
‘Adam’s fall.’ And that shews also how he must by the tenor of  
the sentence have translated the other part too, if he had recited it.

Of learned men that have collected the testimonies of the ancients  
owning and bewailing our original corruption, none, I think, have  
omitted this of Justin. However Vossius in his *Hist. Pelagiana*  
has not. Nor the learned Spencer, *Annot. in Origenem*, p. 54.  
Whose putting this among the other passages of the Fathers which  
speak of *original sin*, shews how he would have translated it. For  
according to Mr. Gale’s translation it speaks nothing about it. He  
curtails the sense of it, that it should not.

The reverend and learned Mr. Bingham, in that elaborate work of  
his, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, vol. iv. chap. 4. § 7, translates it; ‘By  
‘reason of Adam’s sin; beside the particular guilt which each  
‘man,’ &c.

The reader sees what men I have named; and will judge what a  
forehead that man must have, that will not allow them to under-  
stand the sense of a passage in a Greek Father as well as himself or  
the ‘schoolboys.’

He would give a colour to his own translation from the connexion  
which this sentence has with the words next following. Which  
are, ‘For God did this, willing that these (men as well as angels)  
‘should act with a free choice and a free power to do what he  
‘enabled every one to do: that if they did choose what was  
‘pleasing to him, he might preserve them immortal; but if,’ &c.  
Now Mr. Gale says, ‘For Justin to say this, and connect it by the  
‘illative particle, *for*, to another sentence wherein he says, All fell  
‘in Adam, is so great an absurdity,’ &c.

But he perverts the words; and there wants nothing but  
reading them to see, that Justin does not argue, that all fell in  
Adam, and so men had a free choice. But thus; ‘God did this  
‘(i. e. caused his Son to be born, to be baptized, and to be crucified;  
‘which are the very words of the disputed sentence) for men; that  
‘they might once more have a free choice.’ Mr. Gale in his  
English gives no rendering, but only a——for ἐποίησεν, *did it*.  
Which would have made the sense not so easy to be perverted. He  
that will warp one sentence must commonly bend the next.

He spends the next pages in telling us stories of ἀπὸ and παρὰ.  
Ἀπὸ often signifies *from*; as *from* such a place, or *from* such a time;

(who doubts it?) and St. Paul says, *Death reigned ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωσέως*, from Adam to Moses. And if the construction of the sentence had been alike here, it must, I grant, have been so translated here. But he will not deny that it often signifies *from*, i. e. from, or by, such a *cause*, such an *occasion*, such a man's *fault*. As the learned men I mentioned, and, I believe, all translators of St. Justin, have here rendered it.

For *παρὰ* he is more put to it. Yet the *lexicon* does furnish him with a few examples. And then he goes to the books, Dionysius, Thucydides, tells us long stories of two or three fights, where *παρὰ* is so used. The property of one that loves to hear himself talk.

Had it not been more natural, if he had sought the true import of it here, to see how Justin himself uses it? Of which this dialogue would have given him forty or fifty examples where it always signifies, *beside*. There are four or five in the space of a page, p. 69, *edit. prædict.* Another God, *παρὰ τοῦτον*, 'beside him that was seen 'by Abraham.' Christ does nothing *παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ Ποιητοῦ*, *beside* (or without) the will of the Creator. Again, *παρὰ τοῦτον*, *beside* this. And again, *παρὰ τὸν ροοῦμερον Ποιητὴν*, *beside* him that is understood to be the Maker of all things, &c., so p. 78, another covenant *παρὰ τὴν ἐν ὄρει Χωρὴβ*, *beside* that made at the mount Horeb.

If Mr. Gale had amended my translation of the word *αἰτίαν*, there had been more room for his criticism (but that would not have advantaged his plea). I expressed it, 'beside the particular cause 'which each man had of sinning.' It is better rendered, 'beside 'the peculiar guilt (or crime) of every one of them that had sinned.' But this makes Justin not less plainly speak of original sin derived from Adam, *beside* every man's particular and actual offences. *Αἰτία* sometimes is the *cause* or *reason* of any thing; sometimes a *crime* or *guilt*; but never what Mr. Gale renders it, an *act* and *deed*.

Page 283. In answering the next passage, where Justin speaking of the Jewish circumcision, and comparing with it the spiritual circumcision, says of the latter; 'And this we being sinners have 'through God's mercy received by baptism; and every one is permitted to receive it in the same way.' He first manfully proves that circumcision and baptism are two things; and that Justin's saying, we receive circumcision *by* baptism, is not saying, that circumcision itself *is* baptism.

What readers, and what answerers, must this man have? Did ever any one pretend that the *formalis ratio* of them is the same? Or any more, than that one is to the Christians the initiating ceremony



instead of the other which was so to the Jews? This disputant would confute any of the Christian Fathers that should say that *Christ crucified* is to us *the passover lamb*; because one was a lamb, and the other is a man.

He observes that Justin in the same place says, that Enoch and the other holy patriarchs had the spiritual circumcision; and yet, says he, ‘when, where, and by whom, was Enoch baptized?’

The sense is plain to any reader, that Enoch received it without any external ceremony; Abraham and the Jews by external circumcision; and the Christians (as his express words are) by baptism.

Then through three pages he cites sentences out of Justin and other Fathers, (and he might have brought a hundred more,) where they speak of the circumcision of the heart, the putting away the evil of our doings, the purification from all error and wickedness, &c., as being the ‘true circumcision chiefly intended by God;’ ‘the spiritual circumcision, our circumcision,’ &c. And he would argue from thence, that they cannot account baptism to be instead of circumcision; because purification of heart and life is instead of it.

But both of these may well consist. Purity of heart and life is the chief import and aim both of circumcision in the *Old Testament*, and of baptism in the *New*. That does not at all hinder, but that as circumcision was the external sacrament to import this purity in the *Old*, so baptism may be instead of it, for the same purpose in the *New*.

And though the Fathers may in many of their sayings express only the comparison between the carnal circumcision and the spiritual; without mentioning at those places baptism as the sacrament of it; yet it is sufficient that they at several other places do expressly mention it; as Justin does here. For he has been here shewing that almost all the ordinances of the *Old Testament* were types of something under the *New*. As the passover-lamb roasted, of ‘Christ crucified:’ the scape-goat, of Christ bearing our sins, and made a curse for us: the fine flour used at the cleansing of a leper, of the bread in the eucharist: the twelve bells on the high priest’s garment, of the twelve apostles: and several more. After which follows this; how the *Jewish* circumcision was a type of the true circumcision, which we receive, says he, by baptism.

Mr. Gale lays a particular stress on one of the places which he brings [p. 286]; which is a saying of Laetantius: ‘that there was ‘to be another circumcision, not of the flesh, as was the first, which ‘the Jews still practise; but of the heart and spirit.’ Upon which he turns to his *sir*, ‘You see, *sir*, he expressly says, the second

‘circumcision is not of the flesh ; but baptism is plunging the flesh ‘into water, and is therefore of the flesh.’

His *sir* might have had the sense to have told him, that as St. Paul saying that the *true circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter*, does not mean to deny the being of the outward circumcision in the letter, or flesh, but only that the other was the chief: so Lactantius, saying what he does there, does not mean to deny the being of the outward washing of the flesh ; but only that the other was much more to be regarded.

Page 286, where I had said that this saying of Justin is to the same sense as that of St. Paul, Col. ii. 11, 12, where he calls baptism (with the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which attends it) *the circumcision of Christ*, or (as it might more agreeably have been rendered) *the Christian circumcision*: he answers, first,

‘The Scriptures nowhere call baptism circumcision.’

A pretty way of arguing. As if that were not Scripture which I cited. He proceeds, ‘Now if baptism is never called circumcision ‘in Scripture, &c., how natural and necessary does it appear, to ‘understand the circumcision, Col. ii, to mean, not baptism, but ‘purity of heart!’

This is not against me, but against St. Paul; who, notwithstanding that it is nowhere so called in Scripture, ventures to tell those Christians that they *were circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, being buried with him in baptism*.

Secondly, he answers, that St. Paul cannot mean baptism there; because he calls the circumcision he there speaks of, *the circumcision made without hands*: now baptism is not *made without hands*.

This might have been used for an argument (though a weak one) that St. Paul did not mean baptism; if his words had not *expressed* baptism. But as his words stand, it has no other inference, than that St. Paul spoke improperly.

But the propriety of his words may be well defended. Partly because he here joins together the outward and the inward part of baptism; and speaks of them as considered together. And partly because χειροποίητος may very well be taken (as χειρουργικός, a word of the same grammatical import, commonly is) not for every work or thing in which men’s hands are at all used; but for a thing done by chirurgical operation, as circumcision was.

He says, if the circumcision here called *the Christian circumcision*, do consist both of the internal and external part of baptism; it cannot be called circumcision *without hands*; because one part of that is performed with hands; but St. Paul’s direct assertion is,

that that which he speaks of is done without hands and consequently cannot be baptism.

But could he not see that St. Paul does as directly assert that it is by *being buried with Christ in baptism*, as he does the other? What avails arguing that the words should not be so, when they plainly are so? If one of these two consequences must be allowed; either that St. Paul contradicts himself, or else that this is a cavilling argument; I doubt our author and his *sir* will come by the worse.

Page 288. Whereas I had said that the ancients, in conformity to this phrase of St. Paul, were wont to call baptism περιτομὴν ἀχειροποίητον, *the circumcision done without hands*; he says, if my meaning be, that they called the outward part of baptism, circumcision without hands; he has a more honourable opinion of them than to suppose they could be so grossly absurd. I gave at this very place references to the following chapters of my book, in which chapters I set down at large their own words where they do call it so. He has the forehead to say, 'The passages of the ancients our author refers to I have consulted particularly, and I am sure they say no such thing.'

I am not much afraid that any that know me and him will count me to be indeed a liar upon his giving me the lie. But I will set down here again so much of them as is necessary for the reader to see whether he be one, or not.

In my twelfth chapter, part i. [sect. 5. p. 132.] here referred to, I recited the chief passages of St. Basil's sermon 'against the delaying of baptism.' He that reads either the sermon itself, or the sentences which I recited out of it, will see that it speaks of the outward part; i. e. the baptism itself of their bodies. I do not say, that he excludes the inward graces that God would work in their souls, but uses the word as comprehending both. And to those who put off their baptism from day to day, he addresses himself thus:

'A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening that every soul that is not circumcised on the eighth day shall be cut off from his people; and doest thou put off the circumcision made without hands, (ἀχειροποίητον περιτομὴν,) in the putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism, when thou hearest our Lord himself say; Verily, verily, I say unto you; Except one be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God.'

In the fourteenth chapter, [sect. 2. vol. i. p. 144.] (there referred

to likewise,) I shewed how St. Austin quoting this passage in his disputes with Julian, lib. ii. *contra Julianum*, cap. 9, (but mistaking it to be a sermon of St. Chrysostom's,) after reciting the foresaid words, speaks himself thus; ‘You see how this man established in the ecclesiastical doctrine compares circumcision to circumcision, and threat to threat. That which it is *not to be circumcised on the eighth day*; that it is *not to be baptized in Christ*: and what it is *to be cut off from his people*; that it is, *not to enter into the kingdom of heaven*. And yet you [Pelagians] say, that in the baptism of infants there is no putting off the flesh, i. e. *no circumcision made without hands*; when you affirm,’ &c.

I quoted also in the same chapter St. Chrysostom himself, in his fortieth homily on Genesis, taking notice of ‘the pain and trouble’ that was in circumcision; and how favourable God is to Christians in the baptism that he has appointed them in lieu thereof, in these words; *Ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτομή*, &c. ‘But our circumcision, I mean, the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, &c. And it has no determinate time as that had; but one that is in the very beginning of his age, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive (*ταύτην τὴν ἀχειροποιήτον περιτομήν*) *this circumcision made without hands*.’

This is meant plainly of baptism itself; and not merely of the internal effects.

These places Mr. Gale says he had ‘particularly consulted;’ and, not daring to recite them, he assures the reader (who will never hereafter give him credit) that ‘they say no such thing.’

More of the Fathers speaking of baptism being to us instead of circumcision, I referred to, part ii. chap. 10. § 1; as, Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Naz. *Quest. ad Orthodoxos*, St. Ambrose, &c.

At last he says, that if the Fathers, and St. Paul too, do speak of baptism as I pretend, yet this does not affect *infant-baptism*: and then runs on vapouring about the want of consequence from *infant-circumcision* to *infant-baptism*.

But then why did he not say this at first? A man that has true grounds to defend any proposition is a mad sort of disputant, if he strive a long time to defend it by such as are manifestly and notoriously false. For whatever becomes of the consequence, it is notorious that St. Paul and the ancient Christians do speak of baptism as being instead of circumcision; and a man does but disgrace his cause by denying it.

The rules by which he would overthrow the consequence are, if one mind the logic of them, extremely ridiculous. We argue, that



the Scripture ordering *circumcision* to be given to *infants* as a covenanting and initiating seal; and ordering afterward *baptism* to be the covenanting and initiating seal instead of it, does by consequence order baptism to be given to *infants*. He says, this consequence does not hold, because 'it is not ordered' to be given to infants. Which every one sees to be the woman's reason, the denying the conclusion.

Therefore, p. 289, that he may give something like a man's reason, he maintains that the principle upon which the argument proceeds, (viz. that what was done in respect to circumcision must be done now in respect to baptism,) does not hold in two other particulars. One of the *time*, the eighth day; the other of the *male sex*, to which circumcision was limited. And so need not be supposed to hold in this.

To the first of these; I had shewed him, chap. vi, what a large and full answer was given by St. Cyprian and the council in their epistle to Fidus, who had made a like objection concerning the eighth day as he does here: not to oppose infant-baptism, but to tie it to the eighth day. They shew that ignorant disputer, that the circumstance of the day was typical; and had not, by the nature of the thing, the same reason in the 'spiritual circumcision' (so they call baptism) as it had in the carnal circumcision. Now this does not prove but that the principle may hold in all points that are material, substantial, and of moment.

The second, concerning the sex, is, we allow, a difference of moment; as it determines the admitting or rejecting all females from the seal of the Christian covenant; in like manner as this present dispute determines the admitting or rejecting all males and females too under such an age. But he should have considered that we hold the forementioned principle, (what was done in respect to circumcision, must be done in respect to baptism,) with this exception; *unless where Christ has ordered an alteration*. As he has in this point expressly. For St. Paul, speaking of the Christian baptism, Gal. iii. 27, 28, tells us, that whereas there had been a difference made between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and between males and females; there should be no difference made in either of these cases as to baptism into Christ; *So many of you as have been baptized into Christ, &c., there is neither Jew nor Greek, &c., there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus*. Now such an express exception in these particular cases strengthens the law (or principle) in all cases not excepted. Mr. Gale should, if he could, shew us an exception as clear as this concerning *infant* and *adult*; that though

infants were admitted to the one seal, they should not be admitted to the other.

Though all this be plain and obvious, and such as not only any clergyman, but almost any ordinary layman, could have told him; yet he with his usual insolence insults all the clergy upon it. And says,

Page 290, ‘if they were to consider the matter more deliberately, ‘they would be ashamed of all they have urged upon this head.’

True genuine arrogance! He thinks himself capable of making all the clergy ashamed of their arguments. It brings to one’s mind the character which Mr. Stokes (p. 51.) gives of the antipædobaptists (which I would not apply to all; but some, I see, can come up to it). He having there concluded that infant-baptism must have been at the time he speaks of universally received, not only by some particular churches or men, as they pretend, but by all Christians, from hence; that there do not appear to have been any debates or disputes against it; adds,

‘There were certainly no antipædobaptists in those days; or else ‘their temper was quite different from ours. Ours are, many of ‘them, so positive in this controversy, as to unchurch all that ‘differ from them; and of such martial souls, as that a diminutive ‘fellow of scarce common sense shall challenge men of the brightest ‘parts.’ And a little after, ‘Was there not a Danvers———nor ‘a Gale?’

Page 291, where I had brought a passage of St. Justin’s Apology, (owning at the same time that it does not make directly or immediately for or against infant-baptism,) he will have it to make against it; and that for these miserable reasons:

First, if the Christians then had baptized infants, he would have mentioned it, in order to remove out of the emperor’s mind all suspicion of their murdering infants and eating them. To which far-fetched imagination of his, vented before in his first chapter, and brought here again, I answered there more than such a groundless guess could deserve.

Secondly, he would have this passage to make against infant-baptism, because Justin there describes only such circumstances as are proper to adult persons, as making their voluntary choice and professions, &c., and does not mention their bringing their children to baptism.

This is no wonder; since he did not go about to instruct the emperor and senate in all the principles and tenets of the Christian religion, but only to shew that their sacraments had no harm in

them, but were innocent and pious. What he here talks of my making and the church of *England* making two baptisms, one for the adult, another for infants, is nothing but a sample of the insolent liberty he takes to say any thing, true or false, of any man or any church. They use some prayers and exhortations differing in the different cases; and that he calls ‘two sorts of baptism.’

And what he observes [p. 292.] of Justin’s saying that our first generation is ‘without our knowledge or choice;’ but that a heathen man (for of such he there speaks) comes to this baptism (which is his regeneration, or second birth) of ‘his own will and ‘choice;’ is no more than he would have said of any proselyte’s voluntary entering into God’s covenant by circumcision (which the Jews, as I shewed, did also call his regeneration). The adult proselyte did partake of this regeneration by his own choice. This is no proof but that his infant children had the same circumcision and regeneration, by their parents’ dedicating them, and God’s gracious acceptance.

Page 292. I had said that this passage of Justin is ‘the most ‘ancient account of the way of baptizing next the Scripture.’ Mr. Gale adds, ‘and that was *by dipping*.’ Which I do not deny to have been generally and ordinarily so. And whereas he adds farther; ‘Justin here mentions only adult persons:’ I grant that too. But his next words, ‘he elsewhere plainly excludes infants ‘from being then baptized in the church,’ are an open falsehood. And the next, ‘he says that adult persons only can or ought to be ‘baptized,’ are a downright forgery; and just like those of Danvers, which I mention in a like case, part ii. chap. 1. § 5. Let him for shame find where Justin says so; or else take to himself the name of a *forger of sayings for the Fathers*.

Page 293. I had observed that Justin in that passage uses the word *regeneration*, (or being born anew,) for baptism; and so he does plainly. ‘We bring them (the new converts) to the water, and ‘they are *regenerated* by the same way of *regeneration* by which we ‘were *regenerated*. For they are washed with water in the name, ‘&c. For Christ says, *Except you be regenerated, you cannot enter*,’ &c.

Mr. Gale objects, ‘that though he talks of their being *regenerated*, ‘and joins it pretty closely with their being *baptized*; yet he does ‘not say *baptism is regeneration*.’ And then he brings two places more of the same dialogue: one, where Justin says, ‘We are *regene-  
rated* by him, by water, faith, and the tree.’ Another: ‘Him that ‘is washed with the laver which is for remission of sins and *regene-  
ration*.’ And thinks that these and the like expressions make

against my assertion ; whereas they are so many confirmations of it. He says, ‘ Justin only thought that we, some how or other, ‘ obtained or sealed, &c., our *regeneration* by *baptism*, as a mean or ‘ sign, &c., just as we also obtain remission of sins thereby ; but not ‘ that baptism *is* remission of sins or regeneration.’

Thus he would escape. As if our argument depended upon a formal or logical identity of the things. When I say, that by *regenerated* they always mean *baptized* ; I mean no more, nor does the argument need any more, than that *regeneration* does in their sense of the word always imply or connote *baptism* : so that if any author of these times do speak of any person, infant or adult, *regenerated* ; we are to suppose him *baptized*. I expressed it so at several places, as chap. 11. § 4. ‘ They so appropriated that word to baptism, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance that is ‘ *not accompanied with baptism*, from being signified by it.’ Of which I give there several plain proofs. The authors which I cite there, and through all the book, do not stand upon the metaphysical quiddity or *formalis ratio* of the things ; but do sometimes call it *the regeneration of baptism* ; sometimes *the regeneration by baptism* ; sometimes *the baptism of regeneration*, (which is St. Paul’s phrase, Tit. iii. 5,) or *baptism for regeneration*. They generally understand by it a complex notion of the outward act of baptism, accompanied with that grace or mercy of God, whereby he receives the person into a new covenant, or new *spiritual state* (so grossly quibbling is Mr. Gale’s evasion here ; ‘ he must ‘ doubtless mean some farther regeneration than *bare washing* ;’ as if I had ever argued that the *bare washing*, which is only the outward part, were the whole, either of *baptism* or *regeneration*) ; regeneration, in the sense of the Fathers, is, (if we must formally define it,) ‘ the change of the spiritual state of any person granted ‘ by God in baptism.’ And what is fairly concluded from their general use of the word is this, that they give that term of *regenerated* to none but baptized persons.

Of this observation, he says, I mean to make some use afterward. And why should I not, since it is an undeniable one ? And the same may be observed to a good and fair purpose, of the term *ἅγιος*, a *saint*, or *holy*, and several others which are never given but to baptized persons, and are in Scripture or the Fathers given to some infants.

Page 294. When I observed that Justin does here understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, *Except any one be born again, &c., of water-baptism* ; and that all the writers of those first four



hundred years, not one man excepted, did understand it so; he finds out my design, viz. to have it believed that Justin thought that that rule includes infants. Which, he says, is absurd, when I had owned before, that Justin is speaking there of adult persons.

But there is no absurdity in it; for Justin, though speaking there of adult persons, may give a rule out of Scripture for the necessity of their baptism; which rule may reach to the case of all persons, adult or infant, that shall enter the kingdom.

Page 294. In another passage of Justin's Apology, concerning some Christians of his time, sixty or seventy years old, who, he says, ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, 'were' (as I translated it) 'discipled' (or made disciples) 'to Christ in their childhood;' he would have ἐμαθητεύθησαν be translated, 'trained up,' (so then ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ must be *trained up to Christ*), or *instructed*, (and then it is, *instructed to Christ*), and ἐκ παιδῶν to be, not *in their childhood*, but *from their childhood*. And on the latter difference makes a great outcry, and spends two pages.

For μαθητεύομαι, *to be made a disciple*, enough has been said. And since the word joined with it is τῷ Χριστῷ, it is more proper to say, *discipled to Christ*, than *instructed to him*.

And whether this be said to be done *in childhood*, or *from childhood*, is no material difference; save that of a continued act which must last some years, (such as his instruction, learning, or training up,) it is more usually said to be done *from childhood*; but an act done at once is more properly said to be done *in childhood*. Now these are said to have been μαθηταί, or to have been made μαθηταί, to Christ (which term is, I think, never given but to baptized persons) in, or from, their childhood. Mr. Gale brings a great many instances, where a course of *learning, teaching, studying, &c.*, is said to have been from childhood; but there is not among them, nor I believe any where else, an instance of any one that has been said to be μαθητής, or μαθητευθεὶς to Christ, in or from childhood, except he were baptized then. And this sense of Justin's word, speaking of children *discipled to Christ*, in the midst of the apostles' time, (for so far the seventy years do reach back,) is much confirmed by Irenæus<sup>c</sup> (who lived nigh the same time with Justin) using the word 'regeneration unto God by Christ' (a word that constantly implies baptism) in the case of *infants*. Against which testimony of Irenæus, Mr. Gale next brings his exceptions.

Page 297. Because I said that this testimony of Irenæus, reckoning *infants* (as well as little ones, and children and youths, and

<sup>c</sup> [Irenæus, lib. ii. c. xxii. (al. xxxviii.) sect. iv. edit. Benedictini.]

elder persons) among those who ‘by Christ are regenerated unto ‘God,’ was the first *express* mention that I had met with in the Fathers of *infants baptized*; Mr. Gale (as he did once before) in a precarious manner craves all the time before to be yielded to him; because none of the passages before are in *express* words for *infants baptized*; but only such as from which their baptism is concluded by consequence.

But proofs by consequence for any affirmative do give that the advantage against a negative of which there are no proofs at all. And a thing which now is, and beyond the memory of any history has been, the practice of the church of Christ, if it be *clearly* traced up to Irenæus, and by *obscurer* footsteps farther in the scarcity of books that are left, is (if there be no better proofs of the contrary) rightly concluded (as St. Austin argues in this very matter) to have been from the beginning.

Irenæus wrote this about the year 180, that is eighty years after the apostles’ time. And so Mr. Gale would conclude, that ‘the baptism of infants does not appear to have been practised till about ‘the latter end of the second century.’ But what then will become of antipædobaptism, which does not appear to have been practised till after the middle of the eleventh century; and that by a people few, ignorant, and quickly converted?

Besides, though Irenæus wrote this at one hundred eighty; yet sixty years before that, he had been a hearer of Polycarp, who had been an acquaintance of St. John. And what he says of infants being regenerated, or baptized, he does not speak of as any new or controverted thing; but as a known and uncontroverted practice. So that his evidence who was born in, or very nigh the apostles’ time, must be allowed very early. Whether he was born of Christian parents, and baptized in infancy, we know not. But he was a Christian at 120, and remembered from that time.

Therefore because this passage (however he seems to slight it) sticks in his teeth, he labours to overthrow the force of it for forty pages together.

He makes four several attacks against it; but those of a nature so contrary to each other, that if he thought any one of them to be valid, he would have forborne the other three.

The first is, to deny that part of the chapter to be genuine. Which is always accounted a miserable subterfuge, in a book so well known, so constantly read and owned for above fifteen hundred years. And to disown one particular chapter, allowing the rest; nay, one part or sentence of a chapter, (where his error is

confuted,) owning the rest, makes the *postulatum* still more beggarly. He first says, 'It is questioned : ' next, 'It seems to be : ' then, 'It is *undeniably* spurious.' And all this for no other reason, but because it appears that Irenæus was in that chapter (but not nigh the place where he speaks of infants regenerated) mistaken in a point of chronology ; by which reason he might condemn the books, not only of all the ancient *Christian* writers, but of all writers whatsoever of those times.

They having in those times no common æra to reckon by, (as we have now the year of our Lord,) but some reckoned only by the consulships of the city of Rome, (as if we had no other way of dating than by the mayoralities of the city of London,) and some by the years of their kings, or of the emperors of Rome, whose years were always in diverse countries diversely computed, according as their conquests extended to each country :—they, I say, having no better method than these, did never write the history of any thing much before their own time, with any accuracy of chronology.

This all chronologers know to be the case ; and even Mr. Gale (though he seems to be but little versed in that study) must know so much of it, as to be sensible that all men of learning would slight this his exception. But what cares he for that, so it pass with his people ?

He says, cardinal Baronius has observed this ; *Annal. Eccl. ann.* 34.

He and many other chronologers have given their opinion against the determination of Irenæus in this chapter, and elsewhere in his book, that our Saviour lived to above forty years of age. But he, it seems, not minding that this is said by Irenæus at other places as well as here, did cast in some doubtful words, whether this thirty-ninth [twenty-second] chapter were not interpolated at that place ; but not any concerning the place which we are upon, that speaks of all ages regenerated.

Mr. Gale says, the cardinal's reasons have, *he thinks*, never yet been answered.

Nobody is able to help his thinking. But the reasons, as they were at first absurd, have been answered, not only by Casaubon, Dodwell, Petavius, (whom Mr. Gale himself mentions as answering,) but by Feuarentius, who in his second edition of Irenæus<sup>d</sup> shews irrefragably, that one cannot judge this chapter to be spurious from Irenæus' wrong computation of the years of Christ's life that is made in it ; because the same mistaken computation is in the

<sup>d</sup> [Folio, *Coloniæ*, 1596.—a portion of Feuarentius' notes, but not the whole, is inserted in the Benedictine edition, *Paris*, 1710.]

fortieth chapter, where he not only says the same as he does here, but also brings a text of Scripture, John viii. 57, *Thou art not yet fifty years old*, to strengthen his opinion.

This Mr. Gale should have seen, and spared himself, and his reader, and me, the trouble of a cavil of ten pages against the authenticalness of this passage about *baptism*, only because there is in the same chapter a computation (which is perhaps a mistaken one) about the *length of Christ's age*. He shews Irenæus' mistake in chronology, (which is nothing to our purpose,) and his own skill in it, at such a rate, that if a book were to be accounted spurious for having mistakes and contradictions in that art, his, as well as Baronius', must be counted so. There are many great difficulties in that study; and not more in any part of it than in that which is employed in enumerating the years of our Saviour's life.

Baronius could solve them no better than by making Herod live nine or ten years longer than he did. Which is a more palpable mistake than any of Irenæus; and in which Spondanus would willingly have forsaken him; but he excuses himself, that he was an epitomizer of Baronius, not a critic upon him. Dr. Allix calls it, 'Baronius' dream.' And Mr. Gale has dreamed more absurdly, as we shall see.

But first he recites here, as against himself, what Casaubon, and Mr. Dodwell, and Petavius have said in excuse for Irenæus.

What the first two pleaded does not so pertinently come in here. But the answer that Petavius gives is certainly and plainly the true one. Irenæus was engaged against the Valentinians. These heretics made some advantage for their wicked and blasphemous tenets, of the notion (which, though a mistaken one, was then common) that Christ preached but one year after his baptism. Irenæus overthrows, not only the wild opinions which they built upon this notion, but the notion itself; and tells them, that they who pretended to have found out the deep things of God, had not the sense to observe in the plain text of the Gospel, how many passovers our Lord after his baptism is mentioned to have kept at Jerusalem. And he instances in three. One mentioned, John ii. 13, 23: another, John v. 1: and the third, that at which he was crucified. And adds, that the *Valentinians* making him to have lived but one year after his baptism, do take away that which was *the most necessary and honourable* part of his life, viz., that in which he had the age of a *master*, or *teacher*, (*magistri*, διδασκάλον, I suppose,) and was *senior*, an *elderly man*. For that at his baptism he was not full thirty, but as St. Luke



expresses it, *beginning to be about thirty*. Now the age of thirty, says he, is the age of youth; and it reaches to forty. Then at forty or fifty a man comes 'in ætatem seniore[m], to his elderly age; and 'that age our Lord had when he was a teacher. *Quam ætatem habens Dominus noster docebat.*'

Petavius owns this account to be a mistaken one; yet shews that here is nothing wherein Irenæus can be said to contradict himself; he observes that he owns our Saviour at his baptism to have been but thirty, or not so much; nay, that he urges it. And, that he quotes the mention of three passovers after that; which was enough to confute the opinion of his living but one year after. But that he supposes at the same time, that between Christ's baptism and his beginning to preach, there passed so many years as did make up the years after his baptism to amount to above ten, and perhaps twenty, i. e. that after he was baptized, he stayed several years before he entered on his office of preaching; so that he lived in all above forty, and perhaps nigh fifty.

This Petavius takes to have been Irenæus' hypothesis concerning the years of Christ's life. Mr. Gale says, 'he does not attempt to 'prove this;' and does not, or will not see that Irenæus' own words do plainly prove it. *'Triginta quidem annorum existens, cum veniret ad baptismum; deinde magistri ætatem perfectam habens venit Hierusalem,'* &c. 'He was but thirty years old when he 'came to baptism. Then afterward, when he had the complete age 'of a master, or teacher, (which he in the same chapter defines to 'be forty,) he came to Jerusalem<sup>e</sup>.'

So that it is plain Irenæus thought, there passed ten years (the difference between thirty and forty) between his baptism and his first going up to Jerusalem. Now that first going to Jerusalem was at, or presently after, the beginning of his preaching: as appears, John ii. 13.

Though this be very plain; and though it be justly accounted a base thing for any writer in a dispute against an author of credit, not to grant so much as that author makes out plainly and convincingly; but to brawl and contradict eternally right or wrong; yet Mr. Gale, not regarding who Petavius was, and how much the learned world owes him in point of chronology; not only slights his account of the sense of this place, which is a very just one; but throws at him (as he does every where round about upon any that he thinks it his interest to vilify) some of that dirt and contempt which is so natural to him. 'It amounts to nothing.' 'It is too wild

<sup>e</sup> [Irenæus, lib. ii. cap. 22. sect. 4. edit. Benedict. aliis cap. 39.]

‘and fanciful a conjecture to pass, founded purely on Petavius’ imagination.’ ‘Very pleasant indeed.’ ‘It is only begging the question,’ &c.

When a disputant has nothing of sense or truth to oppose to an argument; this faculty, of contemptuous facing and brawling it out, is of considerable use before an ignorant mob; but nowhere else.

If the plea be, that Irenæus was wrong in this computation; and that the time of Pontius Pilate’s continuance in his office of governor having been but ten years (or a little above) in all (as the Roman histories and Josephus do shew); and John’s baptism having begun in Pilate’s time, Luke iii. 1, our Saviour’s death, which was also in Pilate’s time, could not be much above ten years after his baptism:—this must be confessed; nor does Petavius deny it. But Irenæus might be ignorant of these chronological characters, how long Pilate held the office, (for there are no plain footsteps of them in the Gospels,) or might not remember them, or not animadvert to them. And so this chapter may be genuine. As it appears plainly to be by the style and method, and its coherence with the next chapter, and by these two chapters being the only ones that treat on one of the heads proposed in the first chapter of the first book to be treated on.

What Irenæus adds, that ancient men who had been in company with St. John in Asia, did testify that he did use to speak of our Saviour as of one that had arrived before his death ‘ad ætatem seniore,’ ‘to an elderly age;’ and that some other of the apostles, whom some of the said ancient men had seen, did speak to the same purpose; is without ground made another proof of the spuriousness of the book.

It is not said that St. John, or the other apostles, named any number of years; only used the general word, *ætas senior*. And that that must imply forty or more years, is only Irenæus’ notion of the word. The several stages of man’s life, childhood, youth, mature age, &c., have, in different countries, different measures by the use of the place assigned to them.

Beside that in the truth of the matter Irenæus was not so much mistaken as many have thought. By making our Saviour live to forty, he is, if mistaken at all, yet nearer the truth than Mr. Gale, who talks of thirty or thirty-one. So that his severe imputation on Irenæus, [p. 297,] ‘If he was guilty of so palpable a contradiction, he is not to be trusted in any case,’ redounds on himself. And put the case, that Irenæus had fallen into a contradiction of himself in this computation of years long past; would it follow

from thence that he could not give an account of things of his own time, that infants did use to be regenerated, or baptized?

Mr. Gale thinks that at that time they could not be ignorant of the circumstances of time relating to Christ's birth. That is so far from being true, that at that time they did not know those circumstances that were more obvious than the years of his age. They knew not then, nor do we know yet, whose daughter the blessed virgin, his mother, was; nor whether those that are called his brothers and sisters, were only his kinsmen, or kinswomen, or were the children of his reputed father, or even (as some now venture to say) of his mother. The number of years that he spent in preaching was a thing much more obvious and likely to be known, than those of his age. And yet many, before Irenæus, thought it continued but one year; and some afterward, even learned men, continued in that vulgar error. Tertullian, Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c., such poor chronologers they were; and so incurious were they, (provided they remembered the miracles, and practised the precepts,) concerning the time or year in which they were done, or delivered.

Page 299. Our author will no longer fight under Baronius' banner, nor encounter Petavius alone in single combat on his behalf; but will set up for himself a chronological demonstration. And it seems to be the first of that nature that ever he ventured on. A man never exposes himself so much, as when he will needs talk confidently of things he understands not. Declaiming here will not do; nor a good face and assurance. He has the same fate that another adversary, which Petavius had in his lifetime, came to; who having published a chronology, for which he highly valued himself, (as some ignorant readers think our author has shewed great learning in this), Petavius, taking it to task, discovered most egregious blunders in it, advised him never more to pretend to a mastership in that sort of learning; but such a chronologer, says he,

*Discipulorum inter jubeo plorare cathedras.*

I shall not trace the demonstration along by its several steps.

<sup>c</sup> [The person alluded to is Joseph Scaliger, whose work '*De Emendatione Temporum*,' was severely attacked, and the author himself very roughly handled, by Petavius; who possibly, being a Jesuit, could not forgive the animosity which Scaliger had ever exhibited towards that order.

Petavius' large chronological work, en-

titled '*Opus de Doctrina Temporum*,' was published first in 1627; and afterwards, with additions and improvements, by the Jesuit Hardouin, at Antwerp, in 3 vols. folio, 1703.—The author's mean opinion of Scaliger's acquirements in this department of literature is seen in his preface, and in almost every page of the work itself.]

It takes up eight pages. It, I mean, and the large encomium of the 'late glorious,' &c., in the belly of it; whose coming into England is pertinently brought in, to illustrate the notoriety of the time of Christ's coming into the world. One, he says, 'could no more be forgot than the other.' [p. 299.]

It traces in a notable manner the years of Christ's life compared with those of the emperors, sometimes upward, sometimes downward. He demonstrates Christ to have lived, sometimes but thirty-one years; sometimes but thirty; sometimes thirty-three. And 'Tiberius' time after the death of Augustus, (which is known by every historian to a day,) sometimes twenty, sometimes twenty-three. As if a difference of three years were nothing in a dispute, which is but about five or six in all. In the search after the year of Christ's birth, he ridiculously takes it for granted that he was born the first year of the common *era*. And many such proofs of his skill there are.

Many disputes of learned and unlearned, of ancients and moderns, have been concerning our Saviour's age. Whoever of them be in the right, it is certain Mr. Gale is in the wrong; who in spite to Irenæus making it to be but of thirty, or thirty-one, or thirty-three years, does by consequence make him to be born after Herod was dead; and so by another consequence does, instead of proving Irenæus' book spurious, prove St. Matthew's (which places his birth in the days of Herod) to be so. For it is so plain by circumstances, as to be now uncontroverted, that Herod died in the year of the Julian Period 4710. And hardly any do maintain the contrary, but that our blessed Saviour died in the year of the same period 4746, from which thirty-three or thirty-four reach back but to 4712, or 4713. And yet the circumstances of the star; the wise men coming from the East; the forty days of the blessed virgin's purification; the return to Nazareth; the flight into Egypt, and stay there; are proofs that the nativity of Christ was a considerable time before Herod's death.

This ignorance is the more palpable and shameful, because, though he had no skill in chronological calculations, (as it is plain he has not, and therefore should not have pretended to discuss such things,) yet he may be supposed acquainted with our *English* Bible: in several editions whereof, for the use of readers unskillful in such matters, the years of Christ's life are set in the margin against the several passages of it; and he might have seen the thirty-sixth year set to the last of them. If this were only in the church Bibles, he might be supposed never to have seen them. But the lesser editions



with the same chronological notes are common in the hands of children that learn to read the Bible.

There have been Christians so ignorant of this matter, as to think our Saviour lived but thirty-one years, (whom Irenæus here confutes,) but none for these last thousand years. And there have been since some, that thought he lived but thirty-three. But none that had studied that point (except Mr. Gale) for these hundred years. The thirty-third year of the common *æra* is indeed the year on which almost all do place his death. But he that does not yet know that the beginning of that *æra* is several years below the real year of his birth, should not have meddled with this question.

Were it not for one passage in St. Luke, iii. 23, (that our Saviour in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, when he was baptized, *began to be about thirty years of age*,) all the other circumstances mentioned in the Gospel-history are such from which one would have guessed, as Irenæus does, that he had lived to an elder age. That passage has tortured all chronologers who have gone about to reconcile it with Matth. ii. 1, &c., that his birth was in the days of Herod the king. For the fifteenth of Tiberius (taking it according to the common construction) began Aug. 19th, in the year of the *Julian Period*, 4741, (fourteen years then expiring, and the fifteenth beginning from the death of Augustus; which was Aug. 19th, 4727). Now Herod having died (as I said) in the year 4710, (a little before the passover, as Josephus shews,) thirty years reckoned upwards from Aug. 19, 4741, reach back no farther than to Aug. 19th, in the year 4711; which is a year and upwards after Herod's death. So that some greater skill in these matters than our author shews, is necessary to explain these two places of Scripture so as that one of them may not be contrary to the other.

Bishop Pearson (who had studied this matter as deeply as any one) does in his *Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum*<sup>d</sup>, shew the difficulties which still remain in this computation. Some of which I will here set down, that they may abate the confidence of any writer of our author's scantling; who is so far from being able to overcome them, that he does not know of them; and yet reproaches St. Irenæus for being in some mistake in a calculation which no man then or since has been able certainly to fix; but in no mistake so gross as Mr. Gale's own are.

Bishop Pearson had said that the beginning of the Christian church is to be fixed at that Pentecost mentioned, Acts ii, and then adds,

<sup>d</sup> [These are contained in the volume published under the title of '*Opera Posthuma*,' 4<sup>o</sup>, Lond. 1688. p. 27, &c.]

‘ But what year that was in,’ (or, which is all one, what year it was in which Christ died,) ‘ does not, I think, appear from the Scripture. Nor is there any character left, which does certainly and determinately fix it.

‘ That Christ was born under the reign of Herod, we know. How many years he (Christ) lived, is not certainly known. We know that he was born in the time of the taxing made by Cyrenius. But what year that was, the annals do not teach. Therefore there can no certain and undoubted *epocha* be made from the true time of our Saviour’s birth.

‘ That John began the office of baptizing in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, is certain. But how long he had exercised it, before Christ was baptized by him ; how soon Christ after his baptism began to preach the Gospel ; how many passovers there were between his baptism and his death ; does not yet fully appear——&c.

‘ The most ancient Fathers have delivered nothing certain about the years of Christ’s life. The opinion of his preaching but one year, (which is manifestly false,) as it began too early, so it prevailed a long time.

‘ That Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate, is certain. But Josephus briefly passes over the affairs of Pilate in Judæa, and does not distinguish his several years.

‘ That the vulgar *æra* is not true (as to the time of Christ’s birth) we may be sure ; since it does not reach back to the time of Herod ; nor to thirty years above the fifteenth of Tiberius.’

These are the things which Mr. Gale thinks Irenæus must know, all of them. Though he himself knows none of them.

As for the year of Christ’s death, which bishop Pearson thinks not ‘ certainly and determinately’ known ; he himself a little after (because one that would recite the history of any passages in a chronological order must fix some *epocha* or other) fixes it on the nineteenth of Tiberius, which is of the vulgar *æra* 33, of the *Julian* period 4746, as the most probable. And so indeed do all chronologers of late. But how old he was then when he died, or how many years before the beginning of the vulgar *æra* his birth was ; he says nothing there. And I know not whether he did ever afterward discuss that point at large. But in his *Vindiciæ Epistolæ S. Ignatii*, [4to. Lond. 1672.] part. ii. cap. i. he does just mention his opinion, (and his opinion is preferable to some men’s demonstrations,) that the seventh year of the common *æra* was really the thirteenth of Christ’s life ; and consequently the thirty-third (in which he died) must be the thirty-ninth. And how little does this differ from

Irenæus, from whose words all that one can conclude is, that he thought Christ to have lived in all forty or more years? And how little reason had one that is really a learned man (whether exercised in this study I know not) to reckon it amongst the *nævi* or blemishes of Mr. Dodwell, that he thought Christ to have lived to thirty-eight? [p. 304.] Other chronologers do place the nativity, some five, some four years before the first of those which we call *anni Domini*, which was *per. Jul.* 4714. But not one that was ever called ‘learned’ (beside Mr. Gale) so late as that year.

There is no possible reconciling the two foresaid texts without raising the fifteenth of Tiberius higher, or bringing down the death of Herod lower, than they commonly stand in the chronological tables. Many of the ancient Christians, either having no knowledge of, or else not minding, the time of Herod’s death, nor having observed the several passovers mentioned during our Saviour’s preaching, set his birth lower, and his death higher, than is consistent with history.

Of the moderns, Baronius, by the most absurd and inconsistent guess that ever was made, brings down Herod’s death nine years: Scaliger two years.

The rest generally finding that the times of Herod are so connected in history with the years of Augustus (with whom he had a constant intercourse of visits, letters, embassies, &c.) and with the Roman affairs, that his death is set down by Josephus with so many circumstances, (an eclipse for one,) that there is no moving it from its year, have thought there is some mistake in our understanding what St. Luke says of the fifteenth of Tiberius, and our Saviour being then but thirty years old.

Mr. Pagie, having observed that Augustus, four years before his death, invested Tiberius with a proconsulary power, thinks that the fifteenth year of Tiberius’ *ἡγεμονία* may be understood by St. Luke as dated from that time. And then that fifteenth is but the eleventh year of his full imperial power from the death of Augustus; which eleventh year begins Aug. 19th, *anno Domini* 24, and ends Aug. 19th, *anno Domini* 25, *Assinio et Lentulo Coss.* So that our Saviour was thirty-four in that year of Tiberius, which we now commonly call his fifteenth, *anno per. Jul.* 4742, and consequently was born *anno* 4708, which is two years before Herod’s death; which reconciles St. Luke with St. Matthew; and allows our Saviour thirty-seven years complete, and part of the thirty-eighth.

<sup>c</sup> [See his ‘*Critica historico-chronologica in Annales Eccles. Cæs. Baronii*,’ 4 tom. fol. *Colon. Allobr.* 1705. tom. 1.]

But as one that alters any thing in old accounts to stop one gap, does often before he is aware make another; this way of reconciling St. Luke with St. Matthew makes St. Luke disagree with himself: for he, chap. iii. 1, says, that at this fifteenth of Tiberius, Pontius Pilate was governor of Judæa. But in that year, *anno Dom.* 25, he was not yet come to that government. Valerius Gratus as yet held it:

Bishop Ussher is the man who in this and other parts of chronology seems to have considered every circumstance, and to have provided against all objections. He numbers that fifteenth year of Tiberius, not from the death of Augustus indeed, (for thirty years counted back from thence do not reach to Herod's death,) nor yet from the proconsulship; but from that act of the senate mentioned by Suetonius, *in Tiber.* c. 21: and Velleius Paterculus, lib. ii. c. 12: and referred to by Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 3, when Augustus being very old, the senate did at his request confer upon Tiberius an equal power with him in governing *the provinces*. This gave to the *provinces* a reasonable ground to compute the beginning of his 'government' (St. Luke's word is, not *reign*, but *ἡγεμονία*) from that time; and to St. Luke being a *provincial*, to follow that date. This was two years before Augustus died, *anno Domini* 12. And the fourteenth year of this government of Tiberius ended, and the fifteenth began, sometime toward the latter part of *anno Domini* 26. *per. Jul.* 4739. And at that time Pilate may well be supposed to have entered on his office. Then our Saviour was baptized. And thirty years reckoned back from that time make him to have been born the latter part of *ann. per. Jul.* 4709, the fifth year before the beginning of the common *era*, the fortieth of Augustus, reckoning his reign from the murdering of Cæsar. So by this account, *anno Domini* 26, our Saviour was thirty, and entered his thirty-first before the end of that year; and *anno Dom.* 32, was thirty-six, and entered his thirty-seventh before the end of the year; and being put to death at the passover, viz., April 3, of the next year, *anno Dom.* 33, was then thirty-six years old and about a half.

Of the seven years that were between his baptism and his crucifixion, bishop Ussher supposes (as Irenæus does) that several of them passed before he began his public preaching. And it is a very probable supposition. Irenæus indeed supposes too many. But bishop Ussher three and a half. For he reckons that this last seven years of Christ's life was the last week of Daniel's seventy weeks of years; one half whereof was taken up with the preparatory ministry of John, (our Saviour, though then baptized, living a



private life the while,) and the latter half with the ministry of Christ himself; who by this account was thirty at his baptism, *anno* 26 : thirty-three and a half at the first passover of his ministry, *anno* 30 : and (as he supposes four passovers in all) thirty-six and about a half at the last of them, when he offered up himself.

Dr. Allix (the last who has wrote a treatise purposely on this subject; *de Anno Christi Natali*<sup>f</sup>) agrees with bishop Ussher both as to the year on which Christ was born, and that in which he died; but differs about the month of his nativity, and in the distribution of the years of his life. He reckons St. Luke's fifteenth of Tiberius to be the fifteenth from the death of Augustus; the latter part of which falls in the forepart of *ann. per. Jul.* 4742. *anno Dom.* 29; *Duobus Geminis Coss.* And that our Saviour was then baptized. He would have no new interpretation put on Luke i. 3, concerning the fifteenth of Tiberius; but instead of it, helps himself into the road of other chronologers by explaining in his own way Luke iii. 23, which says, Christ was then *beginning to be about thirty*. He says, he was thirty-three. And that St. Luke's word *ὥσεὶ τριάκοντα*, *about thirty*, (he speaking *ἀκυρολόγως*, not pretending to exactness of the number,) will bear that. And that after his baptism there were five passovers before his death; which make up the years of his life completely thirty-seven.

His reason for not allowing bishop Ussher's account of the baptism of Christ, *anno Dom.* 26, (which was the fifteenth of Tiberius' consortship in governing the provinces; but no more than the thirteenth of his full imperial power,) is, that Pilate's government in Judæa could not begin so soon as *ann.* 26; because he, as Josephus says, continued but ten years in the place; and being sent for by Tiberius to answer for his crimes, saved his neck by Tiberius' dying before he arrived at Rome. Now Tiberius' death was March 16th, *anno Domini* 37 : therefore Dr. Allix thinks Pilate must have held his office till the end of *ann.* 36, and consequently, having been in it but ten years, could not have begun it in any part of *ann.* 26.

But Bishop Ussher had answered this objection before it was made. That the hinderances and delays in the navigation to Rome in that winter-time might be more than three months. And besides, the number of ten years in Josephus need not be taken so precisely, as not to admit of six or seven months over. What

<sup>f</sup> [See 'Dissertatio de Jesu Christi Domini nostri anno et mense natali, authore P. Allix.' 8vo. *Londoni*, 1707.]

he says in a cursory way is, that ‘Pilate, δέκα ἔτεσι διαπρίψας, ‘having continued ten years, was driven,’ &c., which is what any historian would say, speaking in brief of the time of so hated a governor, though he had continued for any fraction of months that did not make it eleven. So that being discarded toward the latter end of thirty-six he might have begun in twenty-six.

Whereas there is an objection obvious against Dr. Allix’s scheme ; that if our Saviour had been thirty-three at his baptism, St. Luke, though he might have said *about thirty*, yet would never have used the word ἀρχόμενος he *began* to be, or *was near*, if he were three years *above* it. He answers, that Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* 1, reads it, not ἀρχόμενος, but ἐρχόμενος, (as he does indeed, Ἦν δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὡς ἑτῶν λ.) and that the *Codex Vaticanus* has the text so. To which may be added, that it is pretty plain that Justin Martyr read the text without ἀρχόμενος in it. For he in his *Dialog. circa medium*, p. 94. *ed. Steph.* laying before Trypho a short account of the passages of our Saviour’s life, says, that he, ‘having stayed τριάκοντα ἔτη ἢ πλεονα ἢ καὶ ἐλάσσονα, thirty ‘years, or some more, or some fewer, until John came,’ &c. And it is more intelligible to say, ‘He was about thirty,’ than ‘He began ‘to be about thirty.’

Some chronologers have made much more bold with these texts, to make them agree to their account of time. Some have thought that in Luke ii. 2, which speaks of the *census* or taxing under which Christ was born, (which Mr. Gale thinks might have directed Irenæus to the time of the birth : shewing thereby his own ignorance ; for the time of that taxing is harder to settle than of the birth itself,) the name of Cyrenius, or Quirinius, has been by mistake of transcribers written for Quintilius ; meaning Quintilius Varus, who is much spoken of by Josephus as the ordinary governor of Syria in the latter end of Herod’s time, and is mentioned as such by the Roman historians. And others would have the name Saturninus substituted, who likewise had that place next before Varus ; whereas there is not in Josephus, or any Latin historian, any mention of Quirinius (or Cyrenius) having that government any thing near that time. Ten or twelve years afterward indeed, Sulpitius Quirinius was made governor of Syria, and was ordered to take possession of Judæa, (which borders on it,) and is accounted the first governor of Judæa, (which till that time was governed by its own kings,) and he taxed the people. But this cannot be the time St. Luke means ; for our Saviour was by this time ten or twelve years old.

If we were to admit or suppose any mistake committed by transcribers in the texts concerning Christ's age; I should think it more likely to have been in the numerical word or figure of thirty, than in any other word of the text. It being more ordinary for scribes to mistake in those figures than in other words; and there being several *errata* of that nature in the copies of the Scripture itself: as in 2 Chron. xxii. 2, the number forty-two is kept in the text, though it be plain it should be twenty-two. In this place of St. Luke the mistake of a  $\lambda$  for a  $\mu$ , or (if it were in words) of *τριάκοντα* for *τεσσαράκοντα*, might create all the difficulties we have been speaking of. For there is no other text, nor any other circumstance, from which one would have computed our Saviour's birth to have been so late as it is commonly computed, but this place. There are many, from which one would have guessed it earlier. The only reason that Irenæus or others had to fix or suppose it on the forty-first year of Augustus, (before which year, if we reckon his years from his triumvirate, or first consulship, as Irenæus does, Herod was dead,) was, their reckoning back twenty-nine or thirty years from the fifteenth of Tiberius as ordinarily placed, which cannot be a true reckoning.

Of the many texts, and many circumstances, I spoke of, these are some :

1. From St. Matthew's account one would be inclined to think that our Saviour Jesus was born (not only before Herod's death, as he certainly was, but) a considerable time before it. Epiphanius and others, who had not considered the distance between Herod's death and the said fifteenth year, but allowed the spaces of time, as they thought the circumstances in St. Matthew did require, concluded that his nativity was four years before Herod died, Baronius eight.

2. If more time were allowed, one would reasonably have supposed from the text, that John had begun and continued his baptizing a considerable time before Christ came to be baptized of him. For as Isaiah and Malachi had spoke much of the preparation that he should make for the Messiah by converting the people to repentance; so the three Evangelists who give the history of Christ's baptism by him, do speak of things that might seem to require some time, as done by him, before they relate his baptizing of Christ. As namely, that *he came into all the country about Jordan*, Luke iii. 3: and that *there went out to him Jerusalem and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him*, Matth. iii. 5, 6. And St. Luke having said, verse 15, *All men mused*

*in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or no, says, verse 21, Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also, &c. And St. Paul, Acts xiii. 24, John first preached, before his coming, the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel.*

Now it was the fifteenth of Tiberius, that *the word of God came to John; and he went out, &c.* One might think it was some following year on which Christ was baptized, beginning then to be about thirty. But that cannot be, if that date of time be taken precisely. For it is the hardest matter in the world to bring the fifteenth of Tiberius within thirty years of Herod; and to bring any later year within that space must not be attempted. The chronologers are forced to connect, as close and immediately as possible, the nativity to Herod's death; and the baptism to the calling of John.

3. There would have been no need of stretching the number of the passovers in Christ's ministry after his baptism (which some make three; and that does pretty plainly appear: some four, and some five); nor of supposing that St. Luke counted the years of Tiberius otherwise than from the death of Augustus; if more time were allowed before the baptism.

4. That saying of the Jews to our Saviour, John viii. 57, *Thou art not yet fifty years old*, would make any reader apprehend, that they took him then to be forty or upward. For when they were to express the absurdity of the supposition that he had seen Abraham, being no older than he was; they would not, one would think, call his age much more than they thought it to be. If they had taken him to be but little above thirty, they would have said, *Thou art not yet forty*. Therefore the putting of the case, that he was then forty or more, makes that saying of theirs a much more reasonable answer.

Not to say any thing now of what Irenæus had heard those ancient men say of St. John's speaking of our Saviour, as having lived to 'an elderly age.'

I am far from thinking these reasons sufficient to conclude there has been any alteration in the word *τριάκοντα*, (which was read by Justin, Irenæus, Clement, &c., and is in all the copies that are extant,) but that there is more appearance of reason for that, than for altering the names of the governors of Syria aforesaid.

For as to the difficulties that arise in settling the time of that *ἀπογραφὴ* (the numbering, enrolling, or taxing) mentioned by St. Luke, ch. ii. 2, to have been at Christ's birth; they are more easily removed; not by any alteration of the names or of the words; but



of the translations that have been given of the phrase. The translations represent St. Luke's meaning to be, that this taxing was made, *when* Cyrenius (or Quirinius) was governor of Syria. But it is much more probable that his meaning was on the contrary, to contradistinguish this taxing from that which was in Cyrenius' time; and to signify that this was *before that*.

It is to be noted, that there was a very remarkable change of the government in Judæa, *anno Domini* 7. (which was of our Saviour's true age, according to bishop Pearson, as I quoted before, the thirteenth year; according to bishop Ussher, the eleventh); a *revolution*, accompanied with a taxing of the persons and their estates; which, at the time that St. Luke wrote, many could remember. And of this taxing in Judæa, Cyrenius, a man of consular dignity at Rome, (he had been consul eighteen years before,) being made governor of Syria, (which was a province adjoining to Judæa,) was ordered by Augustus to have the management. The history of it is at large set down by Josephus, lib. xviii.

He had said before, how at Herod's death, the chief of the people having been wearied out by his cruelties, and the grievances which they had suffered under him, (for he had utterly corrupted their church-government, and had made the high-priesthood (which their law accounted most sacred) venal and mercenary; putting in and turning out the high-priests at his pleasure, and choosing for that office men the most hated by the priests and people,) had petitioned Augustus, that they might have no more kings; but that they might be governed immediately by the Romans; to whom they were already tributary. Augustus would have them try once more; and confirmed the kingdom (or *ethnarchy*) to Archelaus; and the tetrarchies to the other sons, as Herod had left it by will. They bore with Archelaus for nine years and part of the tenth. He proving no better than his father, they renewed their complaints and petition. Augustus sent for him, heard the matters, banished him into another part of the world, and reduced the kingdom to a province.

Then, as Josephus relates, lib. xviii. cap. 1, Quirinius was sent to be governor of Syria, and to come into Judæa, which was now annexed to Syria, to seize on Archelaus' money, and to 'tax the people's estates.' One Judas, (whom in the next chapter he styles *Judas of Galilee*,) together with Saddoc the Pharisee, stirred up the people to rebel; telling them, that 'this taxing was a mere bondage; and that they ought to stand up for their liberty; or

‘ else God would not help them. And the people rebelling accordingly, this proved a beginning of infinite mischiefs.’ He goes on to reckon up the governors of Judæa from that time to Pontius Pilate, and from thence to the end of the *Jewish* state.

This taxing was so remarkable a time, that when in any writing or any discourse, there was mention of ‘ the taxing,’ or ‘ the time of ‘ the taxing;’ it would of course be understood of this. Some former numberings and enrollings of the people had gone through all the provinces of the empire: but without any paying of money at the time; but this was a money-tax. So Gamaliel, in that speech of his, Acts v. 37, *After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing*, means undoubtedly this; which had been about twenty-six years before.

When St. Luke was mentioning that numbering or enrolling (for it was not a *taxing*) of all the empire, (not of all the *world*), by order of Cæsar Augustus, under which Christ was born; it might be necessary for him to advertise his reader, that he did not mean this taxing of Judæa by Cyrenius when he was governor of Syria; but one before it. For if the reader had taken it for this, it must have created an utter confusion in his mind concerning the order of time; a mistake of ten years at least, which would have made the history of Christ’s life inconsistent.

And he does, as I take it, so advertise his reader; if his words be construed in a sense of which they are well capable, and which is consistent with history; though all the translations have rendered them otherwise. But Dr. Whitby<sup>1</sup> has, I see, taken notice of this construction, and endeavoured to confirm it; and so perhaps may several other authors whom I have not seen.

St. Luke’s words are, chap. ii: having mentioned a decree of Cæsar Augustus that there should be a *census*, or registering, or enrolling of all the empire, he adds, *Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*. The word *πρῶτος* with a genitive sometimes has, both in Scripture and in other authors, the sense and property of *πρότερος*, *prior to*, or *before* the thing next mentioned. In John i. 15, and again, ver. 30, it is of necessity so construed (as Dr. Whitby observes, *πρῶτός μου ἦν*, *he was before me*. And Nonnus in the paraphrase of that place uses both it and *πρώτιστος* so:

*Πρῶτος ἐμείο βέβηκεν, ὀπίστερος ὅστις ἰκάνει,  
Ὅττι μὲν ἦν πρώτιστος.—*

<sup>1</sup> [See his annotation on the passage, Paraphrase, vol. i. and the note in Dr. Hammond’s Paraphrase there referred to.]

And there are several examples of the like in the Greek writers; some of which Dr. Whitby quotes in his comment on this place.

The sense, I think, requires that it should be so rendered here; *In those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. This taxing πρώτη ἐγένετο was before that Cyrenius was governor of Syria; or, before that taxing which was made by Cyrenius when he was governor of Syria.* Everybody then remembered that taxing. If Christ had been born but then, he would not have been near thirty when he suffered.

Tertullian must needs have understood it so. For he, lib. 4. *contra Marcion*. c. 19, speaks of the enrolling or registering at which Christ was born as being known to have been in the time of Saturninus' government of Syria. 'Constat,' says he, 'census actos 'sub Augusto nunc (lege tunc) in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum.' 'It is known that there was at that time (the time of Christ's birth) a registering of the people in Judæa made under Augustus 'by Sentius Saturninus.' Now if he took it to be in the time of Saturninus; he must know that it was not in the time of Quirinius, (for there was about twelve years' distance between Saturninus' going out of that office, and Quirinius' coming into it,) and consequently must have understood this text of St. Luke, not *when*, but *before* Cyrenius was governor of Syria.

This interpretation of the place is confirmed by the difficulties which all, even the most skilful chronologers, that have taken it in the formerly received sense, have found in reconciling it with the history of those times. Baronius finding the times of Quirinius' government of Syria too late for Christ's birth, thrusts it up eight years without any other reconciling of passages, than saying broadly, 'Josephus is mistaken.' Others being aware that this is too gross, (for this revolution of the state of Judæa is connected by circumstances with the Roman affairs,) do allow this taxing to have been at this time, as Josephus sets it, after Archelaus' banishment. But then they think that there was another registering or taxing of the whole empire before this, in Herod's time, under which Christ was born; in which they are certainly in the right (Tacitus says, that Augustus made such rolls or reviews more than once): but then they suppose farther that Quirinius was governor of Syria then too. And so the words of the English and other translations would infer.

Now this last is a very improbable thing. Josephus particularly names the governors of Syria during the latter part of Herod's reign. Not the years indeed of each of them; but by circumstances,

Titius must have been five or six years before Herod's death: presently after he speaks of Saturninus, with whom Herod had much converse and business; and he seems to have held the place three or four years. And he says expressly that Saturninus was succeeded by Varus, in whose time Herod died; after Varus had been his neighbour (as one may judge by the circumstances of their converse) about a year. So that here is no room for Quirinius. Some suppose therefore that Quirinius never was the *ordinary* governor of Syria in any part of Herod's reign, (for that would have been mentioned,) but that while Saturninus, or one of the other, was the *ordinary* governor, Quirinius was sent with an *extraordinary* commission to tax Judæa<sup>m</sup>. But this is very hard to suppose, while Judæa had its own king. These sort of governors were not sent, except into such countries as were reduced to *provinces*; as Syria had been now for a long time, but Judæa not yet. But suppose it; still there does not seem any reason that, in order to tax the people of Judæa, he should be made governor of Syria.

The translations do not make very good sense. They do not know what to do with the word *πρώτη*. The vulgar, 'Hæc descriptio prima facta est a præside Syriæ Cyrenio.' Some mean by it, 'Hæc prima descriptio.' Others, 'Hæc descriptio primum facta est.' As ours, *This taxing was first made when, &c.* Concerning any one taxing it cannot properly be said to be *first* made at such or such a time; for one taxing is made but once. They who think Quirinius was twice governor, would, I suppose, if the words would bear it, translate; 'This taxing was made when Cyrenius was governor the *first* time.' But neither will the words bear that construction; nor is there any appearance that he was twice governor.

But if we understand it; *This was a taxing* (or registering) prior to (or before) *that which was when Cyrenius was governor of Syria*; both the word *πρώτη* is necessary in the sentence; and it agrees with the history of the times.

I know that Justin Martyr, in his *Apology* to the emperors, does suppose Christ to have been born at that time when Quirinius, being made the ordinary governor, did tax Judæa. His words shew that he means that time. For he calls Quirinius the first governor of Judæa for the Romans. During the time of the kings, the Romans had no other governors in Judæa but the kings. But when Archelaus (the last king, or ethnarch, there) did, as we call it,

<sup>m</sup> [See Dr. Hammond's note upon the place.]



abdicate; then the Romans sent governors to receive the taxes and tribute. And of these Quirinius was the first. But for Justin to set the date of Christ's birth at this time, is a mistake of above ten years, and proves nothing but (what I said before) that the Christians of those times had no skill in keeping the account of time. Irenæus made no mistake comparable to this. And yet nobody for this has judged Justin's Apology to be spurious; nor even for his mistake of making Ptolomy Philadelphus contemporary with Herod, which is a mistake of above a hundred years.

I have been larger in this than was needful for answering Mr. Gale. Every one sees how poor an evasion it is, to deny the authenticalness of any ancient Christian book, because it has mistakes in the chronology of the years of Christ's life. The explication I have given of St. Luke's words concerning the taxing does not, I confess, settle the time of it; it shews it to have been before Quirinius' time, (and so removes a puzzling difficulty,) but not *how long* before. I do not write these things for Mr. Gale, to whom they are useless; nor for the learned in chronology, to whom they are needless: but that the ordinary reader may have a conception of the years something nigher the truth. Let us see some of Mr. Gale's arguments.

Page 301. He says, 'It was commonly known from the censual rolls of Augustus, both at what time and in what place our Lord was born.' And therefore he thinks Irenæus, or any of the ancient Christians, could not mistake the time.

To say, 'It was *commonly* known,' is gross ignorance, if he thinks so; and a gross abuse of his ignorant reader, if he say it without thinking so. That there were rolls of the number of citizens or freemen in each province, laid up for some time in the Capitol, or such like place, is very probable. But there is no account of any Christian that ever saw them; nor likelihood that they might have had the sight and searching of them, to find the name of any particular person, if they had desired it. But he talks as if they were common in everybody's hands. If any Christian had ever seen them, and had seen our Lord's name *Jesus* registered, as the son of Joseph and Mary, born in such a year of Augustus, and had declared to his fellow-Christians such his account; this had at once ended all disputes and mistakes; and all Christians after that would have agreed in one account. Whereas we see on the contrary, that those few of the ancients that about a hundred and fifty or two hundred years after the time have said any thing about it, have differed very much; not only Irenæus, but all the rest.

Neither they nor we having any plain proof of the very year when Christ was born, or when that *census* or taxing was, but these two : it must have been in Herod's time ; and it must (if the words are taken strictly, and no mistake be in the copies) have been at or under the distance of thirty years reckoned back from the fifteenth of Tiberius computed from some *epocha* ; but it is not certain from *which*.

He says, Justin Martyr and Tertullian do appeal to these rolls kept at Rome.

Justin does, at the place I just now mentioned, (*Apol. 2. circa med.*) tell the emperors, that it had been prophesied that the Christ should be born at Bethlehem, a village nigh Jerusalem ; and that our Jesus was accordingly born there, 'you may,' says he, 'learn 'from the tax-rolls made by Cyrenius, your first governor in 'Judæa.' He supposed or guessed that there were then remaining in the emperor's custody such rolls, which they might, if they please, search ; but it does not follow, that any one that would might search them ; much less that any one had searched them upon this account. And the saying of Tertullian imports no more. He speaks of them as of rolls, which one might suppose to be kept in the Roman archives ; not as though he had seen them, or had any account of any one that had ; much less as though he knew what they contained concerning Christ's birth, or the time of it. And indeed, if there were then any in being, and Justin and he had been permitted to search them ; one of those two would have searched in the time of Quirinius, and the other in the rolls of Saturninus, as I shewed from their several words.

It is probable enough that both of them were mistaken in their guessing that the names of particular persons were set down in them. Suppose the names of every one, and the parents of every child, were set down in the first copies drawn up in the several provinces ; yet it is likely that in those copies sent to Rome and laid up there, there was recorded only the number of persons in each city, tribe, &c., and the value of the estates. Else, the account of all the provinces and kingdoms of that empire would have filled books too many for one house to hold. In short, these rolls, if they had been searched, might have given some light : but since nobody did search them, neither did Irenæus know, nor do we know, what was in them. Besides, that Irenæus' mistake was not in the date of Christ's birth. He sets that at the forty-first of Augustus ; which is the time, or within a year of the time, that the chronologers would have it ; and which they think those rolls, if they

had been searched, would have confirmed. His mistake was in the number of about ten years which he supposes our Saviour to have lived after his baptism, and before his preaching; which number of years the time of Pontius Pilate, reckoned by Josephus to be but ten years, will not allow. He had not read, or did not mind, that limitation of ten years in Josephus. Just as Mr. Gale had not read, or did not mind, that of St. Matthew, that he was born in Herod's time, which will not allow him to have been so young as thirty at the fifteenth of Tiberius, taken by the ordinary account.

Page 301. 'If Christ lived but forty years from the forty-first of Augustus, he could not be crucified in the reign of Tiberius.'] Why not? The forty-first is indeed too late upon other accounts. But if he had been born *ann. per. Jul.* 4710, (in which Augustus began his forty-first year,) since Tiberius lived to 4750, *anno Dom.* 37;—there is the distance of forty years. Our Saviour did not indeed live to that last year of Tiberius. But why does Mr. Gale say, that if he had, he would not have been forty?

Ibid. 'Pilate was removed from his government at least a year before Tiberius died.'] Whence comes this news? Josephus relates how Vitellius, governor of Syria, hearing of Pilate's villainies, sent Marcellus to take care of Judæa, and ordered Pilate to be carried to Rome to answer for his crimes before Tiberius; but before he was brought thither, Tiberius died. That sailing to Rome could not take up nigh a year.

P. 302. 'He was made governor in the twelfth of Tiberius, and continued but ten years.'] Bishop Ussher shews that it must have been ten years, and some months over. Now from the latter end of Tiberius' twelfth year, to his death, are but ten years seven months.

Ibid. Mr. Gale runs downward seventy years to the destruction of the *temple*, to find the time of Christ's birth; reckoning backward up again the years of the emperors that were between; not one of them being truly accounted. The aim is, that since that destruction happened *anno Dom.* 70. he may, by subtracting out of seventy the years that passed between Christ's death and it, leave but a few for the time of his life. He cites authors that say forty (or some of them forty-two) years were between the passion and that destruction. This would leave for Christ's life but thirty or twenty-eight. Our chronologer himself was ashamed of this foot of the account. By adding some scraps to the emperor's years, he makes the sum (which really was seventy and no more) seventy-one. So he leaves our Saviour thirty-one. And, to the shame of

all chronologers, and of St. John, (who recites at least three (probably four) passovers after the baptism at about thirty,) says, p. 303, 'about which age (viz., thirty-one) he was crucified.'

Could not this poor accomptant perceive where the mistake of all this lies? The destruction of the Temple by Titus was indeed *anno Domini* 70. That is, seventy years, and no more, had passed from the beginning of the common *era* by which we reckon the *annos Domini*, to the time of the destruction. But does it follow that no more years had passed from the *true* time of Christ's birth? Every body that has spent an hour in these studies knows that *era* is too short, and that our Saviour was born several years before the beginning of it; six, or five, or four at the least. Else nobody need study for the time of Christ's birth; but depend upon it, that it was from this present year 1719 years. And our disputant seems to know no better.

In the same page he very seriously quotes Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Phlegon, as authors by whose computations the erroneous account of Irenæus may be made apparent. There Phlegon places the fifteenth of Tiberius (when St. Luke says our Saviour was baptized) forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, *anno Domini* 70. And Clemens and Origen place our Saviour's *passion* forty-two years before it. And he takes notice that Phlegon says so *expressly*; and that Irenæus cannot be supposed ignorant of it. Does he think these accounts to be true and consistent? If not, why does he dwell upon them to the reproach of Irenæus? But if he do, (and he seems to think so in earnest,) then our Saviour died two years before he was baptized.

Rather he might have seen by this, that all men in those times, as well as Irenæus, were at a loss in counting the years of our Saviour's life.

That he may shew some of his own skill in chronology, beside what he quotes from authors; he says here, that this Phlegon wrote a little before Irenæus was born; and the next page but one, says, he wrote but in Hadrian's time. Does he think that Irenæus was not born before Hadrian's time; and especially the latter end of it, *anno* 138, to which year Phlegon brings down his chronicle? This cannot be Mr. Gale. This must be spurious.

Page 303, he runs over the same computation again, out of Josephus, after a more absurd manner than before. He gives us a table of the years of the emperors; wherein the reign of Tiberius is twenty, which every one knows was twenty-two and above a half; and which he himself in the page before had set down twenty-



three. The foot of this account is in the next page, 'Christ must 'have suffered at near thirty years of age.' Boys that are taught arithmetic, if they perceive the total sum to be certainly wrong, cast it over again and amend it, before they shew it their master. Here is a proficient who shews his calculation to all the world, the foot whereof stands as you see.

Page 302, he has given us an *ὑπόθεσις* of his own, (which if it had been true, would have compensated the *tedium* of reading all this trash,) that there are observations of *eclipses* that will settle all this matter. How ignorant have all chronologers been, who have in volumes disputed a question which this young master in the art can demonstrate at once! 'It is plain,' he says, 'from, &c., and 'from the observation of eclipses, that Augustus died fourteen 'years after the birth of Christ.' Now the year of Augustus' death we all know; that it was *per. Jul.* 4727. *duobus Sextis Coss.* which is *ann. Dom.* 14, and the day *Aug.* 19. So then Mr. Gale's eclipse will fix our Saviour's birth some time in the year before *ann. Dom.* 1. *per. Jul.* 4713.

I should be unwilling to have so mean a thought of this corrector of Irenæus, as that he should intend no more than that Augustus died in the year aforesaid, (which every one knows,) and that an eclipse that year at a certain distance before his death, and another in the same year at a certain distance after it, do confirm that to be the year which the historians who mention his death do mean: but that if he be asked, how old our Saviour was at that year, *ann. Dom.* 14, whether fourteen, or sixteen, or eighteen, or twenty; and desired to prove his answer by the history of some eclipse happening at a known distance from our Saviour's birth; he should have nothing to say, but only that Augustus died in the fourteenth year of those called 'the years of our Lord.' We must not think so poorly till we hear farther from him about the eclipse. He himself has said four or five times over, that the birth was the forty-first of Augustus; and says in the next page, that Augustus reigned fifty-seven years (so he did, reckoning from the death of his uncle; and something over): the eclipse, when it comes, will make these pages spurious. Or else, that fifty-seven exceeds forty-one but by fourteen.

Page 304. Mr. Gale makes a second exception against this passage in Irenæus, wherein infants are reckoned among those who 'by 'Christ are regenerated unto God;' that we have not the original words of it, (as indeed we have not of any of his works, except a few fragments,) but only a translation in Latin.

But since this translation is so ancient; made either in the author's own time, (as Dr. Grabe thinks,) or at least (as he proves) soon after; and has been quoted, owned, and acknowledged all along ever since; this must appear, to any reader of those ancient books, a very frivolous evasion; made only for the necessity of an hypothesis, which cannot stand a fair trial. But this it is to have to do with an adversary that runs from the matter in hand into long disputes and cavils about the authenticalness of the books.

All, or in a manner all the quotations that have been made by the Latin Fathers from Irenæus have been taken from this translation, and have been allowed; and it is too late now to demur to its authority; especially in such a place as this, which runs agreeably, and pertinently, to what goes before, and what follows.

It is indeed composed in an uncouth and barbarous *Latin* phrase; partly for that the translator had but a mean faculty in that phrase, (which is no exception against the truth or faithfulness of the translation,) and partly for that he has aimed to keep in his *Latin* all the idioms of the *Greek* which he translated; and to render every sentence *verbatim* (which will make any translation barbarous). But this rather assures than overthrows the repute of its fidelity; and is the case (though not perhaps in the same degree) of all in that time, who translated the books of the Gospel, or any book which they accounted of awful authority; as is apparent in the fragments that are left of the old *Italic* version, and in the whole *vulgar Latin* translation of the Bible; and much more in the *Greek Septuagint*.

This is it, which the writers whom Mr. Gale quotes here do note as a fault in the translation; that it is in a dull, barbarous, impolite style. They do not impeach the honesty of the man. His fault was, aiming at an excessive exactness. That unhandsome expression of Scaliger's, (which nobody but Mr. Gale would have expressed with an air of seriousness,) that 'the translator was an ass,' is taken out of a book, which has done Scaliger a great deal of discredit<sup>n</sup>; as the like usage has done to Luther, and some others. Both these men gave their pens too much liberty in censorious and extravagant expressions; but it seems they gave their tongues more. And they have had, after their death, friends or else enemies, who have published to the world all their rash sayings spoken in passion, dispute, or table-talk. Which course, if it were taken with the best men that are, would expose their character. It is well when a man's sedate thoughts are worth publishing. Nobody's tattle is.

<sup>n</sup> [The collection entitled 'Scaligerana:' see the passage alluded to, quoted at vol. ii. p. 305.]

As for the instances which Mr. Gale has picked out of the whole five books, where there is some variety between this translation and some transcripts of the original, found in Eusebius, Epiphanius, &c., they are not more considerable for sense, nor more in number, than are found in the copies of any book whatever, that has had so many copies transcribed of it, as this book and translation must be supposed to have had. Epiphanius might transcribe from one copy which had some various lections, which the copy made use of by this translator had not. There are none that alter any doctrine, history, &c., delivered by this holy Father. Mr. Gale, who excepts against any doctrine of Irenæus being proved by this translation, might with the same face except against any one translation of the Bible. For in comparing that one with some other copies and some other translations, there would more various lections be found. And whatever various lections there are of any other place of Irenæus, there are none of the place before us.

To one that is so endless in his cavils and exceptions against books and translations, we must, I think, stop his mouth with that answer of Mr. Stokes, p. 43. ‘It is your common method to evade ‘the authority of the Fathers, by saying, they are but translations, ‘&c. But you have neither originals nor translations of those early ‘times, on your side.—Were there no antipædobaptists then, to ‘translate?’ &c.

Page 307. If the place must be allowed for genuine; yet Mr. Gale will not be found without something to say. His third exception is, ‘that by the word *regenerated* in it, there is no reason to understand *baptized*.’ And whereas I had said that the word *regeneration* does in the usual phrase of those times signify *baptism*; this he not only denies, but with that rudeness which seems natural to him, says, it is a sign that ‘I never read the books of those times;’ and, that ‘nothing can be more apparently false.’

To satisfy the reader, who might not be acquainted with those books, (for they that are do know it themselves,) I referred to what I had said in the *introduction*, concerning the *Jews* applying this word *regenerated*, or *born again*, to the proselytes whom they baptized; and concerning some places of Scripture, where it is so used: and I added at the place itself for the present some sayings both of the *Latin* and *Greek* Fathers, which do plainly shew, that they not only used that word for baptism, but also that they so appropriated it to *baptism*, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance, that is ‘not accompanied with baptism,’ from being signified by it. That I did it in that chapter itself, where I quote Irenæus; but

the whole book afterward is full of quotations, (I think above a hundred,) where this sense plainly appears. Which the reader must turn to, if he would see which of us is guilty of the ‘apparent falsehood.’

What he has to overthrow them, is,

Page 307, *First*, for the *Jews*. He first broadly denies that they used any initiatory baptism of proselytes at all, (by which you see what an adversary I have got, that will deny what every body knows to be true,) and faces it out, that he has proved they had none. Those that will may take a journey to *St. Alban’s* to see his proofs. But it will be to no purpose; since he declares beforehand in effect, that he will not lose if none be found. For he adds, ‘However if it should be allowed they had such a baptism; I believe they nowhere call it *regeneration*.’ I had shewed him where they call it so. He observes; the word there is *new-born*. And that any one becoming a proselyte is not said to be *new-born* neither; but *as new-born*.

I suppose he has some disciples whom he can convince that *new-born* and *regenerate* are not the same thing; because one begins with an *N*, and the other with an *R*. And some Nicodemuses, who will not believe they could be *new-born* or *regenerate* without entering the second time into their mother’s womb. When our Saviour says, *born again*, is it not meant, *as born again*?

If they were *new-born* and *regenerate* too, Mr. Gale will not yield. He denies that they were put into that state by *baptism*.

But it had been largely shewn before, that they accounted them to be made proselytes by *baptism*. And therefore to say, ‘If any one become a proselyte, he is like a child new-born;’ is as much as to say, ‘If any one be baptized.’ But he observes, that in one of the places ‘the same is said of a slave made free,’ that he also is as a child new-born.

Maimonides does express that resemblance between a *Gentile* proselyted, and a *slave* made free; that each of them is like a child new-born: which comparison does the more lively express the regeneration spoken of. A slave, when made free, is *regenerate*, i. e. brought into a new state, in respect of temporal concerns; as a proselyte, when baptized, is, in respect of spiritual concerns. It is the spiritual regeneration we are speaking of.

But he pleads, ‘Why should not their circumcision——be the *regeneration*, as well as baptism?’

I grant it. A proselyte, or a proselyte’s child, was at that time to be circumcised and baptized; and both together were the symbol



of his regeneration. And so it would be now to a Christian's child, or a man turning Christian, if Christ had appointed both to be used. But as he has appointed baptism only; that only now is the symbol of the new spiritual state entered into, i. e. of the regeneration. But to conclude, as Mr. Gale does, that the passages which I there produced, intimate no such thing of either of them, is like him. For they speak it plainly.

Being no better able to maintain his denial of this phrase used by the *Jews*, he turns the dispute into railing; 'If all the rabbins did assert this; is it becoming a Christian divine to forsake the Scriptures to follow the rabbins?' A calumny this is; to call that the forsaking of the Scriptures, which is used as a help for the better understanding the language of them.

Secondly, for the Scripture.—Mr. Gale, who had before told his reader that I pretended no proof from Scripture, comes the second time [p. 309.] to attack my proof from John iii. 5, *Except any one be born again, born of water and of the Spirit, &c.*, that the Scripture does call our baptism our *new birth* or *regeneration*. He confesses those words 'are a little obscure since the prevailing of infant-baptism.' For, he says, since that time 'all that were baptized were spoken of as regenerated. And then infants being baptized, they must be taken to be regenerated too.'

Now by this chronological calculation of the time when persons baptized were spoken of as *regenerated*; that it was since the prevailing of infant baptism; it appears that not only Irenæus (who in the place we are upon speaks so) lived since that time; but our Lord also. For that which is in other places expressed, *baptized with water*, and *baptized with the Spirit*, he in this text expresses, *born* (or regenerate) *of water and of the Spirit*.

Page 309, he says, 'the mistake may be easily seen. For our Lord does not say, *born of water alone*, but *born of water and the Spirit*. He does not speak of two new births, one by water and one by the Spirit; but only of one, which was to be of water and the Spirit in conjunction.'

Now these are indeed the plain words; and this is the very sense of the place. And it is what we urge against the antipædobaptists; and what, if they would keep it in mind, would set them right. Therefore see how long he is able to stand to this. Within the space of a page he has these words, in contradiction to our Lord, and to himself. 'The baptizing in water is not the regenerating'—(Not that alone, we know. But he adds farther)—'The regeneration really consists but in one,' &c.—'He speaks only

'of being born of the Spirit.' And again, p. 311, 'Our Saviour means only being born of the Spirit, by or in the use of baptism with water, as the external symbol and seal of such regeneration.'

Our Saviour certainly means as he says, *Born of water and of the Spirit*. And it is Mr. Gale's own mistake in the import of the word, that makes him think our Saviour's speech must be construed otherwise than the words stand. He thinks that *baptism* means only the outward part, the external washing; whereas it is (as he had better expressed it before, in explaining the new birth) one *baptism*, or one *regeneration*, of water and the Spirit in conjunction. This mistake appears to hang in his mind by what he says,

Page 310, 'Christ speaks of *spiritual* regeneration, and no other. For had he by *born again* meant baptism,' &c.

He speaks indeed of a *spiritual* regeneration, i. e. of the persons coming into a *new spiritual state*. Which is effected by the outward action appointed by Christ, accompanied with the grace and operation of his Spirit. As for the sense in which a baptized infant is *born of the Spirit*, I have been forced to speak of it twice or thrice already. Mr. Gale will not seem to understand that there is any efficacy at all of God's Spirit extended to infants to put them in a new spiritual state; but yet he dares not openly deny it.

He refers here, p. 309, to the twenty-fifth article of the church of England, as if that made for him. There is nothing there for his purpose. Our church plainly owns two parts in one sacrament; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace. If he pleaded only, that the '*inward spiritual grace*,' the being born of the Spirit, is the chief, no man would oppose him. Every one knows it.

Ibid. From another place of Scripture, which I tried to show that the Scripture applies the word *regeneration* to baptism, it will appear by Mr. Gale's rule, that St. Paul also lived 'since the time that infant-baptism prevailed.' For he uses it so; Tit. iii. 5. *He saved us by the washing [or baptism] of regeneration*.

Mr. Gale allows that 'by the *washing of regeneration* is meant *baptism*; that is,' says he, 'by the whole phrase;' but then he brings in a logical quibble about the quiddities of the things; that *washing* denotes baptism; but *regeneration* does not.

This metaphysical distinction is grounded on that mistake of his, (which I mentioned just now, and which runs through all his arguings, that the sacrament of baptism consists only in the outward part, the corporal washing; and it is nothing pertinent to our argument. For the argument requires no more, than that the word *regeneration* does generally in the Scripture (as here) and more

constantly in the ancient Fathers, carry along with it a supposal of baptism, (whether as a cause, or effect, or necessary adjunct, is nothing to the purpose of our argument,) so as that wherever any Christian author speaks of any persons *regenerated*, (as Irenæus here speaks of infants regenerated,) we may conclude they were *baptized*. That regeneration does connote baptism, the reader saw before at his p. 293, and sees here, and will see again; that whenever he is put to a shift, he flies to this logical quirk for an evasion. I gave a solution of it, in answering his foresaid page 293.

Page 311, he objects that baptism is often called *the baptism of repentance*; and yet that repentance does not signify baptism.

This then shews the difference between the use of the word *repentance*, and the use of the word *regeneration*, or new birth; that the name of *penitent* is often in the Scripture and the Christian writers given to persons not yet baptized; or is given to them in respect of some great change and recovery from a sinful course into which they had after baptism fallen; but the name of *regeneration*, or *regenerate*, never. In this very chapter concerning Irenæus, I gave the words of Gregory Nazianzen, warning a baptized person against falling back into courses of wickedness; ‘There is not ‘another *regeneration* to be had afterward; though it be sought ‘with never so much crying and tears.’ And yet he grants in the next words that there is repentance after baptism. The baptism of John is often called *the baptism of repentance*; (and all the three places of Scripture, which Mr. Gale produces here, Mark i. 4, Acts xiii. 24, and xix. 4, speak of that;) but none but the baptism of Christ is called *the baptism of regeneration*. Whatever epithets may be common to baptized and unbaptized persons, the term *regenerate* is not.

Page 312. Concerning the use of this word among the ancient Christians; whereas I had said that in their *usual phrase* it signifies baptism; he in *his usual phrase* says, ‘It is one of the most ground-  
‘less assertions that I ever met with,’ &c.

Now the thing is what every one that has read them knows to be true. But how shall one convince his readers? If any of them has read but so many of them as are recited in my book, he must see that this answer of their defender is not true. Mr. Whiston, though he be engaged on the same side, yet having read what I say, and what he says here, owns in his ‘Primitive Infant-baptism,’ p. 7,

‘That regeneration is here [viz. John iii. 3, 5.] and elsewhere ‘(generally, if not constantly) used with relation to baptismal ‘regeneration, is undeniable.’

Mr. Whiston adds, 'not as supposing the bare outward ceremony 'to deserve that name.' Which we all know. To disprove this use of the word, he tells his *sir*, that he has already shewn him that Justin by the word *regeneration* cannot be understood to mean baptism.

The words of Justin which I produced, [part i. p. 42.] concerning new converts that came to be baptized, were; 'Then we bring them 'to some place where there is *water*; and they are *regenerated* by 'the same way of *regeneration* by which we were *regenerated*; for 'they are washed with water in the name,' &c. The reader must pardon me for troubling him with the words over again; for I must declare, and I do it in cool blood, I never met with any one of so finished effrontery to deny things that are plain and visible. When Mr. Whiston said, this use of the word was *undeniable*; he meant it could not be denied by any man of tolerable modesty.

For other Fathers after Justin, he has been searching the *indexes*; and though nineteen in twenty of the places to which they directed must have been plain for this sense; he has found some that may bear a cavil.

There is hardly any word whatever of so determinate and constant a meaning, when it is applied to one subject, but that, if it be used in relation to another subject of a different nature, it takes a different sense. The word *baptism* itself is found sometimes used in relation to *sufferings* or to *vices*; *baptized* with afflictions, or in voluptuousness, &c. This does not hinder us to say, that the word *baptism* has a constant signification, viz., the *sacramental washing in the form appointed*. So if I say that the word *regenerate* has a constant sense among the ancient Christians, to mean, or connote baptism; no man of sense will challenge me with instances, where the *world*, or the *earth*, &c., is said to be *regenerated*, i. e. *new made*, *new moulded*, &c., because he naturally knew I was to be understood concerning the sense of the word, when it is applied to men; and in their religious concerns.

And even when they are applied to the same subject (as *regeneration* to men) it is also common for all words to be used sometimes metaphorically, and by way of allusion. In which cases no man expects a strict account of the same sense of a word as it has in its ordinary signification. But such differences as these do always appear by the scope of the place. Now must I follow Mr. Gale in an impertinent ramble which he has made to pick up some such instances. They begin at

Page 313. There he brings two places of Origen, where, by his own confession *παλιγγενεσία* is taken for the *resurrection*, the *day of*



*judgment, the world to come.* Our *English* translation, in one of the places which Origen there quotes, Matt. xix. 28, renders it, the *regeneration*. But Origen takes it (and, I suppose, rightly) for that time of *new-making*, or (as St. Peter, Acts iii., calls it) *restitution of all things*. To what purpose does Mr. Gale bring these places here?

Yet they might have been of some use to him. For they might have taught him to construe and translate that passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 3, of which he had just before made nonsense. Clement's words are good sense; speaking of the Brachmans. *Καταφρονοῦσι θανάτου, καὶ παρ' οὐδὲν ἡγοῦνται τὸ ζῆν· πείθονται γὰρ εἶναι παλιγγενεσίαν.* 'They fear not death, nor esteem life; for they believe that there is a resurrection.'

The place that he quotes, page 315, of Clemens Romanus, may most fitly be considered here beforehand; because the sense of it is like these other. He says, 'Noah preached *παλιγγενεσίαν* to the world.' Which is meant either (as Junius, the first editor, understands it) a *resurrection*; or else, that he by preparing the ark admonished men of that destruction and *renovation* of the world, which was then coming and did quickly come; *whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished*; and the restoring it was a *παλιγγενεσία*. Mr. Gale is angry with Junius for spoiling one of his quotations; and accosts that learned man with his usual rudeness; 'it is strange what could be in Junius' mind.' In a case where every reader sees that himself is in the wrong.

These places, where *regeneration* is applied to the world, should not have been set down at all in a question concerning the sense of that word when it is applied to the spiritual concerns of a person.

He has found two places where it is applied to a person; but in a very metaphorical way, which runs out from the common road of the use of words, and they are both in Clemens Alexandrinus, who generally gives himself a latitude in that way.

One is, that recited by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. 23. In that example shewn by St. John of the recovery of the young apostate from a state of soul that might have been thought desperate, by a repentance as extraordinary as the fact had been, Clement aims to express it in words also alike extraordinary. In the description of the repentance, among other expressions, he has this, (which Mr. Gale should not have omitted,) that he 'was *βαπτιζόμενος ἐκ δευτέρου*, baptized the second time with his own tears.' And in carrying on this hyberbolical allegory, he says, St. John shewed in this performance *μέγα γνώρισμα παλιγγενεσίας, καὶ τρόπαιον ἀναστά-*

σεως βλεπομένης, ‘a great pattern of a regeneration, and instance of ‘a visible resurrection.’ In the same sense that he calls it a *regeneration*, he calls it also a *baptism*, and a *resurrection*; both one and the other hyperbolically expressed. For as, properly speaking, there is but one *baptism*; so Gregory Nazianzen (as I there cited him) says, ‘there is not a *second regeneration*.’ Not but that they allowed *repentance* afterward; but they in ordinary speech called no repentance by the name of *regeneration*, but that upon which any one was *baptized*.

The other is *Strom.* ii. p. 425. He had been speaking of the duties of matrimony, and the great guilt and mischief of adultery. And then says, τί οὖν νόμος; ‘what provision does the law make against ‘this?’ The substance of the answer is, that in order to clear the world from such mischiefs, the law orders the adulterer and the adulteress to be both put to death. And then he pretends to shew that the provision made by the Gospel is not inferior to this; that the law and the Gospel do agree, &c. Ἡ γάρ τοι πορνύσα, &c. ‘For a woman that has fallen into adultery, is indeed as yet alive ‘in (or to) sin; but she is dead ταῖς ἐντολαῖς to (or by) the ‘commandments (dead in law). But she, when she has repented, ‘οἷον ἀναγεννηθεῖσα, being, as it were, born over again by the change ‘of her manners, παλιγγενεσίαν ἔχει ζωῆς, has a resurrection to life. ‘The former harlot being dead; and she that was begotten by ‘repentance coming to life again.’

Mr. Gale, not observing the occasion of these words, (which was not in the *index*.) has lost the emphasis of them; and translated them wrong [p. 314]. For τεθνηκυίας μὲν τῆς πόρνῆς τῆς παλαιᾶς can never be construed, ‘she is dead to the former adulteries;’ but ‘the ‘former adulteress being dead.’

Nobody would seek for the ordinary sense of a word from such a sentence as this, which all runs upon a *quasi*. She is, *as it were*, another woman; and so is, *as it were*, born again. And in the following words, ἀπὲρ λίθόλευστοι γίνονται, ‘they are at present ‘stoned,’ he means, they are by the sentence of condemnation in the Gospel, *as it were*, or in effect, stoned.

There are none of the other instances which he gives of the use of the word (which are at all pertinent to this matter) but what may, I think, be fairly supposed to have in the author’s meaning a relation to baptism; though he has picked out one or two where this relation is not at that place expressed. Tertullian says, ‘We are born in the space of ten months; which is the number of ‘the commandments, by which’ (or in which, or unto which) ‘we

‘are regenerated.’ Which may be paraphrased, or baptized. For the baptismal sponson was, as, to believe in God; so also, to keep his commandments. In which respect, as they often say, we are *regenerated* (or baptized) to, or into, the *creed*, or faith; so here Tertullian means; we are *baptized* to, or unto, the keeping of the commandments.

The rest of the places he cites, either have not the word at all, (as that of Barnabas, which he calls a very remarkable one,) or have it in a sense which is plainly enough, and in some of them expressly, applicable to baptism.

In Clement’s *Epitomæ et Eclogæ* there is much talk of baptism; mostly concerning the Valentimians’ way of explaining the doctrine thereof. And it appears that they, as well as the catholics, gave it the name of *regeneration*. There are such sayings as these: Epitom. p. 802. ‘Our regeneration is from water and the Spirit.’ And a little after; ‘Therefore our Saviour was baptized, though not ‘needing it himself, that he might sanctify all water to those who ‘should afterward be regenerated.—By it (meaning this *regeneration*) we are cleansed not only in body, but also in soul. And it ‘is a proof of even our invisible (or inward) parts being sanctified ‘by it, that unclean spirits, which are infolded in the soul, are ‘purged away by this new and spiritual birth. The water above ‘the heavens. For as much as baptism is performed by water and ‘the Spirit,’ &c.

All this stands together in Clement. And yet Mr. Gale,

Page 314, leaves out all the rest, and quotes that scrap out of them; ‘This new and spiritual birth, (or generation):’ and would make his reader believe they are spoken without any reference to *baptism*.

And at the same place he quotes out of the preceding page of Clement, p. 801, ‘Baptism, which is the sign of regeneration;’ as words making for his turn; and says, ‘Clement is so far from ‘leaving any room to imagine baptism was called *regeneration*, that ‘he expressly says, It is the sign of it.’

All such places do, as I said before, help to prove that the ancients connected the notion of regeneration with that of baptism; not limiting themselves to one logical idea of the word; but using it sometimes for the inward part of the sacrament, and oftener for the whole complex notion of it; as it is not half a page from this, where the words I last quoted are, ‘Our regeneration is by water ‘and the Spirit;’ but never speak of it as a thing that can be separate from baptism. Mr. Gale’s business was, to prove that the

word is used without including, supposing, or connoting baptism : so as that the infants, which Irenæus speaks of, might be called *regenerate* without being baptized.

One more observation he makes,

Page 314, out of these Excerpta, p. 800, which is a notable one. Clement, he says, ‘instead of calling baptism *generation*, or *regeneration*, directly on the contrary calls it *death*, and the end of the ‘old life.’

Now see the whole sentence. ‘Therefore baptism is called a ‘*death* and the end of the *old life*; since we renounce all evil ‘powers: but *life* according to Christ, who is the only Lord of it.’ Did not he make a hard shift for this quotation? And is it not a learned argument, that baptism, if it be a *death unto sin*, cannot be a *new birth* unto righteousness?

For other books of Clement, where he speaks, not the sense of the Valentinians, but his own, Mr. Gale at

Page 313, quotes his *Pædagog.* lib. i. p. 90, saying, ‘God receives ‘those that fly to him, καὶ ἀναγεννήσας τῷ πνεύματι εἰς υἰοθεσίαν, and ‘having regenerated them by the Spirit to the adoption of sons, ‘ἡπίους οἶδεν, finds them to be of a good disposition, and loves ‘them,’ &c.

What difficulty could Mr. Gale find in apprehending the *regenerating of them by the Spirit* to be in the use of baptism; and in the same sense that our Saviour expressed, *Except any one be regenerated by water and the Spirit*? Is it because Clement does not mention the water at this place? But he does at forty other places; as in the same book, p. 133, ‘God has made man of the dust, regenerated ‘him of water, perfected him by the Spirit, instructed him by his ‘word,’ &c.

Mr. Gale says, ‘Here ἀναγεννήσας πνεύματι, I hope, cannot be ‘thought to mean *baptized*, especially since it is said that those who ‘are so regenerated are ἡπιοι.’ Is not such arguing intolerably impertinent? Does baptism hinder people from being good, meek, or humble?

The same Clement, *Strom.* 5, p. 552, for a proof that the notion of *regenerating* by baptism is general, says; ἐπεὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάροις φιλοσόφοις τὸ κατηχήσαι τε καὶ φωτίσαι, ἀναγεννῆσαι λέγεται. ‘Since ‘even among the heathen philosophers, to instruct and *baptize* is called ‘to *regenerate*.’ Mr. Gale, that he may turn this (which is indeed a proof of our sense of the word) to a proof against it, translates it, ‘to instruct and enlighten the understanding;’ not knowing, or not willing to own, that φωτίσαι in Clement and other the most ancient



Christian writers, is used for *baptizing*. That Clement uses it so, is apparent from forty places; but particularly from one which Mr. Gale saw, and quoted a little before a part of the paragraph, in the story of the young man whom St. John recovered from his lost condition. The first part of that story was, that St. John committed him to a bishop, who (as St. Clement relates it) took him home to him, educated and instructed him, &c., καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἐφώτισε, ‘and at last baptized him.’ And (that Mr. Gale may be sure that is the meaning) the next words are; ‘but after that remitted of his care; for that he had now given him the perfect preservative, the seal of our Lord.’

And that the heathens did use a baptism, such as St. Clement here speaks of, and did call it *regeneration*, he saw in that passage of Tertullian, (which I cited, *De Baptismo*, cap. 5, ‘Tinguntur, idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuriorum suorum agere præsunt.’ ‘They are baptized: and say they do it for their regeneration,’ &c. And adds afterwards; ‘This is the aim of the devil imitating the things of God.’ By which he must refer to the *Jewish* baptism.

Page 314. He brings a place of Origen on John, p. 124, and gives a translation of it at large. But to what purpose in this question, no reader can guess. There is nothing in it against, but rather for, the notion of regeneration by the Christian baptism. The substance of it is, that as the cures wrought by our Saviour on the *bodies* of men did promote a *spiritual* good; inasmuch as they invited to the faith those who were benefited by them; so the baptism of *water* is, even of itself, a principle of heavenly gifts to him that yields himself up to the divine power of the invocations of the adorable Trinity. That the Spirit came upon those who were baptized, as is related in the Acts, so visibly (the water preparing a way for him in those who came in sincerity) that Simon Magus being amazed, &c. That the baptism of John was inferior to that of Jesus. That the effect of *regeneration* was not had with John, but with Jesus baptizing by his disciples. Then follow the last words, ‘And it (viz., *the Christian baptism*) is called the washing of regeneration, being performed with the renewing of the Spirit; who being the Spirit of God, is now also carried (or moveth) upon the face of the water, but does not come upon all men after the water.’

The term *regeneration* is here mentioned. But is it not here, as it is every where else, referred to *baptism*? Mr. Gale does not tell us what he cited this sentence for. If he lays his stress upon the last words, which he translates, ‘which is now also preferred above the

‘water,’ (as if that were any news, that the Spirit of God is preferable to the water,) that, though undoubtedly true, is a mistaken and ignorant translation of Origen’s words here. For ἐπιφερομένου ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος does not signify that; but is a recital of that expression, Gen. i. 2, καὶ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος: *And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the water.* Origen meaning to express how in the sacrament of baptism the Holy Spirit is present and does ratify the promises thereof, does (in allusion to that Scripture phrase, of his being at the creation *carried* (or moving) *upon the face of the water*) speak of it as being so in the case of baptism also. Τοῦ καὶ νῦν ἐπιφερομένου: ‘who is ‘now also, i. e. in this case also of baptism, accompanying the ‘water.’ But to say, that ‘now also (i. e. in the administration ‘of baptism also) the Spirit of God is preferred above the water,’ is too insipid a sense for Mr. Gale to ascribe to Origen. And if it were the sense, it avails nothing to the proof of that which he brings it for, viz., that Origen mentions here *regeneration* without connoting baptism; for it is the *baptismal regeneration* that he is speaking of.

Thus I have had the patience to follow him, and trace all the quotations he has brought against me; which, after all, do prove utterly impertinent to the purpose he brings them for. And indeed it was impossible to disprove a thing so certainly true as this is; that this word is constantly used by the ancients with a relation to *baptism*. Or if there were, among thousands of instances, one or two where that sense did not appear, (as it happens in the case of almost all words, that a man may light on some few places where they are used in an odd and improper sense,) yet that ought not to be accounted sufficient to overthrow a general rule.

The sense was so known and universally received both in the Greek and Latin church, (which concurrence of the two churches in the use of their phrases does not happen always,) that a writer citing a place out of another author, or out of the Scriptures, will sometimes (quoting by memory) use one of those words, where his author had used the other. As Clement, in one or two of the places which I have recited, quoting the Scripture where Christ was *baptized* by John, expresses it, ‘*regenerated* by him.’ And St. Hierome does the same. And so on the other side, The Constitutions, lib. vi. cap. 15, citing John iii. 5, *Except any one be born of water, &c.*, expresses it; λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος, ἐὰν μὴ τις βαπτισθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος, &c. ‘The Lord says, *Except any one be baptized with water ‘and the Spirit.*’

Beside the drudgery, I must bear with his reproaches :

Page 315. ‘And now could any body, sir, that had read these passages, fairly pretend, &c. If Mr. Wall had not read these books, he ought not so readily, &c. If he has read them, what excuse can be framed for him?’

I have read so much of them, that I am sure of one of these things ; that either he has not read them any other way than by *indexes* ; or else does not understand them ; or else against his conscience faces out a sense contrary to what he sees in them. For in several of these places which he cites, the sentences before, or after, make it palpable that this word is taken in that sense against which he contends. Most that he here brings are out of Clemens Alexandrinus. No writer can shew the sense in which he takes the word *regenerated* more clearly or positively. To give one instance ; to which others, if they be searched, will prove like. Mr. Gale brings a passage out of his *Pædagog.* lib. i. p. 90, where he would pervert the sense, as I shewed just now. If he had read on, he could not have mistaken. For in the next page but one, p. 92, where Clement disputes against some who pretended that baptism does not put us into a complete state of Christianity, (they required something else ; I know not what,) he has such sayings as these ; ἀναγεννηθέντες οὖν ἐνθέως, &c. ‘When we are regenerated, (by which he means plainly there, *baptized*,) we presently receive the perfection, &c. When our Lord was baptized, αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτίζομένῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ, presently came the voice from heaven, declaring him *the beloved*, &c. Let us then ask these wise men ; was Christ, as soon as he was *regenerated*, ἀναγεννηθείς, perfect, or not, &c. As soon as baptized by John, he is perfect, &c. He is perfect by the laver alone ; and sanctified by the coming of the Holy Spirit on him.’ And a little after. Ὁ μόνον ἀναγεννηθείς, ὡςπεροὺν καὶ τοῦτομα ἔχει, καὶ φωτισθείς, &c. ‘He that is once regenerated (as the name of that thing is) and enlightened, is presently freed from darkness, (or the state of darkness,) and receives from that time light, (or the state of light.)’

Beside that the words *baptized* and *regenerate* are here used promiscuously ; and that Christ himself is here said to be *regenerated* (which it were blasphemy to assert in any other sense than *baptized*) ; here are the very terms of the question. ‘Regeneration,’ Clement says, ‘is the *name* for baptism.’ Which is the direct contradictory of what Mr. Gale would prove out of him.

This question, whether the word *regeneration* does always imply *baptism*, is but subservient to the main question ; whether infants

were at this time baptized. But there is in this same *Pædagog.* of Clement, lib. iii. c. 11. p. 247, a passage which speaks of them not only as baptized then in Clement's time, (after the apostles 90,) but also as baptized in the apostles' time, and by the apostles. I am ashamed I had not found it, when I published my *collection* of such passages. I have been lately advertised of it by learned men. I shall not recite it here; but in an *appendix* at the end of this defence, which shall contain that, and one or two more quotations fit to be added in another edition of my 'History of Infant-baptism;' if it ever have another<sup>a</sup>.

Page 315. Mr. Gale says of me; 'What excuse can be framed for him? For it is apparent from these instances, &c., that the 'most ancient Fathers, by *regeneration* mean something *spiritual* and *internal*, and very different from *baptism*.'

Now the dream is out. It seems he has disputed against *regeneration* in baptism all this while; as supposing that there is not, or that we hold that there is not, any thing *spiritual* or *internal* in baptism. Whether any book whatever could have taught this man modesty, civility, or humility, I know not. But a catechism (if his mother had had the grace to teach him it) would have instructed him, that the sacrament of baptism consists of two parts: 'the 'outward visible sign; and the inward spiritual grace;' the one done, or used, by men, by Christ's appointment; the other conferred by his own merciful covenant and promise. The Fathers take it no otherwise. All Christians, protestants and papists, take it no otherwise. If he had ever been at church, and had seen any person, adult or infant, baptized; the sentences, prayers, and thanksgivings, used in that office, do all express this. He has so long studied what βαπτίζω signifies in the heathen poets, when they talk of *washing* wool, &c., that he has quite forgot what it imports in the Scripture and in the Fathers; when it is a holy sacrament, and the outward action is attended with God's heavenly grace and mercy, putting the person into a new spiritual state. So here is half his book written on a wrong and ignorant supposition; and must be begun again.

Since this testimony, concerning *infants regenerated unto God by Christ*, is taken from Irenæus; I had shewed that, as the other Fathers, so he particularly does in all other places of his book, which I had seen, use the word *regenerate* so as to include the notion of *baptism* in its signification. And I recited one place, lib. iii. c. 19,

<sup>a</sup> [This is added to the third and the present edition, forming the ninth section of the third chapter. See vol. i. p. 52, &c.]



where he plainly does so. And Dr. Grabe had made the same observation on the same place.

Mr. Gale,

Page 315, 316, insults me, as having not read the several places where Irenæus has the word. And for the place which I had cited, attacks Dr. Grabe for understanding it so. 'I am surprised that the learned Dr. Grabe should refer to it also with the same design as our author.'—ὅς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν.

There is no dealing with such a face, but reciting again the passage. The title of the chapter is, 'De eo, qui descendit in ipsum, Spiritu. Of the Spirit which came down on Jesus.' It is to be noted that the Cerinthian and the Valentinian heretics divided *Christ* from *Jesus*; and said, that *Jesus*, of himself, was a mere man; but that at his baptism *Christ* (meaning a Divine power, or a Divine person) came down upon him. Irenæus maintains the Scripture doctrine, that *Jesus* and *Christ* are the same one person; and that *the Holy Spirit* came down upon him. And the substance of the chapter is, to recite such texts of Scripture as do teach us the nature of the Holy Spirit. It begins thus:

'The apostles might have said, that Christ came down upon Jesus, &c.—But they neither knew of nor said any such thing, &c.—But what was true, that they said, *That the Spirit of God came down upon him like a dove.* That Spirit, which was spoken of by Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.* And again, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me.* That Spirit, of which our Lord says, *It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* Et iterum, potestatem regenerationis in Deum demandans discipulis, dicebat eis; Euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.' And again, 'when he (Christ) gave his disciples the commission of *regenerating* unto God; he said to them, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*'

He goes on to recite ten or twenty texts more, where *the Spirit* is mentioned, as Joel ii. Ps. li. Acts ii. John xiv., &c.

Now that in this text of Matt. xxviii. 19, (where he observes that *the Holy Spirit* is one of the Divine persons, in whose name we are baptized,) that commission which he calls the commission of *regenerating* unto God, is the commission of *baptizing*, is so plain by the very words of the sentence itself, *baptizing them in the name*, &c. that instead of spending time in proving it, or in answering the cavils that he raises from some words of the other texts, not at all

pertinent to the explication of this, I shall only desire any one to read them, as a specimen of the property of an everlasting caviller against things that are plain.

He observes that Irenæus, commenting upon other texts recited in the same chapter, speaks of this Holy Spirit ‘working in men the ‘will of God, and renewing them *a vetustate in novitatem Christi*, from ‘their old (or natural) state to a new state in Christ.’ No doubt but these are offices and operations of the Holy Spirit, wrought partly in baptism, and partly at other times. But none of his offices have, in the phrase of the ancients, the name of *regenerating*, except those which he does at baptism. At another place in the same chapter Irenæus says, ‘Our bodies have received that union ‘which is to immortality by the laver (or *washing*), but our souls by ‘the Spirit. So that both of them are necessary; since both do ‘profit us to the life of God.’ Upon which Mr. Gale says, this shews that ‘he argues here chiefly upon that which is spiritual; ‘and implies the regeneration he has before spoken of was such.’ If that will do his cause any service, we will grant, that both of these together do constitute and make up the *regeneration*; and no doubt but the office of the Holy Spirit is by far the *chief* of the two.

Dr. Grabe, in his notes on this place of Irenæus where infants are said to be *regenerated to God*, (by which he, as I think all that know the ancient phrase, understands *baptized*,) did in confirmation of that sense refer to another book, where Irenæus uses the same phrase and applies it to baptism, viz. lib. i. c. 18.

There Irenæus relates, how corrupt and abominable doctrines the Valentinians held concerning the sacrament of baptism. It is to be noted, that they call baptism *redemption*; or (as some of them seem by Irenæus’ words to have explained themselves) the outward part they called *baptism*; and the inward and spiritual grace *redemption*. And he says, they had as many several ways of this redemption, as there were leaders of mystagogues among them. But all so corrupt, that he affirms (and says it will appear when he comes to refute their particular tenets) that ‘this sort (or generation of ‘heretics) has been sent out by Satan *εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος* ‘*τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν*, for the ‘frustrating of the *baptism of regeneration to God*, and the destruction ‘of the whole faith (or Christian religion).’

This phrase, where Irenæus calls the regular Christian baptism (which the Valentinians went about to corrupt and alter) *the baptism of regeneration to God*, Dr. Grabe referred to, as confirming

that sense of the other place (where infants are said to be *regenerated to God*) to be, that they were baptized, and had that their *regeneration*, which Irenæus mentions, by baptism.

Page 317. Mr. Gale faces it out to that most learned, judicious, and modest person; ‘It is, I think, directly to the contrary sense.’ And that, for no better reason than that Irenæus does not here say that baptism *is* regeneration; but only calls it ‘the baptism of regeneration.’ Let the reader scan this reason, and be amazed at the degree of assurance of this man.

Irenæus says in the next words, that the Valentinians do say, that this *redemption* of theirs (i. e. those profane and blasphemous rites which they set up instead of the Christian baptism, and of which I gave some account in my book) ‘is necessary for all that have ‘received the perfect *γνῶσις* (all true Gnostics,) that they may be ‘*regenerated* unto that power which is above all.’ By which they meant a power, or God, far above the God of the Christians, the maker of the world.

Here Mr. Gale says; ‘This being said of those who deny baptism, the word *regenerated* cannot mean *baptized*.’

But cannot he see, that though they denied (or frustrated) the true Christian baptism, (as Irenæus in the words before charges them,) they set up ceremonies and forms of words, to be used with the water, which they called the true baptism, and *redemption*, and that which gave them the true *regeneration*?

By this we may see that these heretics as well as the catholics (and, as we have seen before, the Jews and heathens) did attribute to their several *baptisms* the name and power of *regeneration*. So general was this notion.

Mr. Gale perusing the account of the fancies of these heretics, catches hold of another twig. They said, ‘Baptism is of the *Jesus* ‘that was visible, for forgiveness of sins; but *redemption* is of the ‘*Christ* that came down upon him, for perfection.’ (This, by the way, shews who they were, whom Clement speaks of in the place I recited just now, that said baptism alone did not make us *perfect* Christians, without some other rites; the *Valentinians* said, their mysterious words and rites were needful for *perfection*.) They said moreover, that ‘one of these (*baptism*) is a carnal thing; the other ‘(their *redemption*) is a spiritual thing.’ Mr. Gale says, ‘This sufficiently distinguishes *baptism* from *redemption*.’

So it does. Just as he did even now; when he said, p. 315, ‘The ancient Fathers by *regeneration* mean something spiritual and ‘internal, and very different from *baptism*.’ It looks as if he meant

these for his ‘ancient Fathers.’ For I know of none but them and himself, that have taken baptism for only the outward (or as they call it, *carnal*) action; or that argued, as he does, any thing ‘spiritual’ and internal’ to be ‘very different from baptism.’ And since, as they divided *redemption* from *baptism*, so they did *Jesus* from *Christ*; even let him take them. And let him make much of them; for none in all antiquity talk of baptism so like him as they do.

At the foot of this account, p. 317, he is, he says, ‘pretty well’ assured (I never knew him otherwise) that this word does never in ‘Irenæus mean *baptize*.’

Yet he begins again;—having found out of himself two places in Irenæus where this word is. One, lib. iv. c. 59, the other, lib. v. c. 15.

The latter of these, nothing but an extraordinary fit of honesty could make him publish. Irenæus is there speaking of Christ’s curing the man born blind, by making clay with his spittle, and anointing his eyes, and bidding him wash, &c. and thus descants upon it; that as Christ, working the will of his Father, did at first make man’s body of clay, so he here made, or repaired, the organs of sight with it. ‘And because man, being in his first formation, ‘in the human way of *generation*, formed (or born) in sin, did need ‘the *washing* (or *laver*) of *regeneration*; after he had put the clay on ‘his eyes, he said to him, Go to Siloam, and *wash*; restoring ‘to him at once both the formation (viz. of his eyes) and the *regeneration* which is by washing (or the laver).’

If this washing was not to him the sacramental baptism; yet it is plain that Irenæus says what he says here in allusion to it. In the same sense that it was a *regeneration*, it was a *baptism*: both perhaps but by way of allusion.

Mr. Gale comes here again with his quiddity; and says, *regeneration* which is *by* the laver, is different *from* the laver. Not minding that the force of his objection is equally taken off by its so accompanying the laver, as never to be without it in the sense of the ancients. He may see here, that they did not regard logical niceties of expression. That which is called in the first part of this sentence ‘the laver of regeneration,’ is two lines after styled ‘regeneration by ‘the laver.’

In the other place, lib. iv. c. 59, I can sooner see that it makes nothing to Mr. Gale’s sense, than I can, what sense it does make. The sentence is certainly mangled. The text, both in Feuarentius’ and Dr. Grabe’s edition; ‘Quemadmodum [Dr. Grabe reads *quomodo*] autem relinquet mortis generationem, si non in novam



‘ generationem mire et inopinate a Deo, in signum autem salutis  
 ‘ datam, quæ est ex virgine ( ) per fidem regene-  
 ‘ rationem?’ These are words that can have no construction at all<sup>b</sup>.  
 If there be inserted (as Dr. Grabe guesses there should; and  
 Mr. Gale makes it the text) within the *unci* which I have left, the  
 words ‘ credens eam recipiat quæ est’ it may be construed; but so as  
 to have but a very obscure sense or emphasis; not to be understood,  
 but by minding the title and scope of the chapter.

The chapter is against the Ebionites; whose infidelity consisted  
 partly in disowning the Divine nature of our Saviour; and partly  
 in disbelieving his birth of a virgin; they took him to be born and  
 conceived in the ordinary way. The words immediately preceding  
 these are of the necessity of our believing him to be God and man.  
 ‘ How can they be saved, if he that on earth wrought their  
 ‘ salvation were not God?’ &c.

These words must be understood of the other point of their  
 unbelief. And ‘ novam generationem’ must mean that *new way of*  
*generation*, which God caused our Saviour to be conceived and born  
 by. And the words, ‘ in signum salutis datam,’ refer to that  
 prophecy made to Ahaz, who for a *sign of his deliverance* had it said  
 to him, Is. vii. 14, *The Lord himself shall give you a sign: behold a*  
*virgin shall conceive, &c.* And then I think it is;

‘ How shall any one leave the generation of death (escape that  
 ‘ death which attends the natural generation), if he do not (believing  
 ‘ in that new way of generation which was given by God for a sign  
 ‘ of salvation, to be in a miraculous and inconceivable manner by a  
 ‘ virgin) receive that *regeneration* which is by the faith (or Christian  
 ‘ creed, or belief)?’—if he do not receive that *regeneration* or baptism,  
 which is, into the true faith, or creed? ‘ To receive that regene-  
 ‘ ration which is by the faith,’ is a like phrase to that which he uses,  
 lib. i. c. 1. *prope finem, τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας—ὃν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσ-*  
*ματος ἐλήφεε*. ‘ Who holds steadfast that rule of truth which he  
 ‘ received at his baptism.’ For all the creeds of the churches of  
 catholics in those times, into which they were baptized, whatever  
 article they omitted, had that of the *conception*, or birth of a virgin;  
 and that the rather for the sake of these Ebionites, who had begun  
 in the apostles’ time; Irenæus’ admonition to them to ‘ receive their  
 ‘ *regeneration* by,’ or according to, the *faith*, or belief of Christians,  
 may well enough be understood to be, by baptism into the true

<sup>b</sup> [Compare the note above p. 318,  
 where this proposed emendation is con-  
 sidered.]

<sup>c</sup> [Page 44 in Grabe’s edition: but in  
 the Benedictine, chap. ix. sect. 4. p. 47.]

faith. Mr. Bingham and others have shewn, that *πίστις*, *the faith*, is a common name for the creed.

However, if Mr. Gale (who gives no paraphrase or explication at all how this sentence is to be applied to the Ebionites) do not approve of this, one instance, in a sentence which has been so mangled, cannot set aside a general rule, otherwise known, concerning the use of a word. The next words are, ‘What adoption shall they have of God, if they continue in that generation (or birth) which is according to man (or natural to man) in this world?’

Page 318. Here Mr. Gale concludes more modestly than ordinary; and the assurance sinks in one and the same sentence, from a very high to a very low pitch. ‘If there should be *some* instances, where it (regeneration) does *sometimes* signify baptism; there are *many more*, or at least *some*, where it plainly signifies quite another thing.——If it does not mean baptism *always*; then *perhaps* it may not in this place.’ How, alas! is this Mr. Gale altered from that Mr. Gale who in the page before was so *assured*!

I gave this for one reason that Irenæus, when he speaks of infants *regenerated*, must mean *baptized*; because an infant is not capable of regeneration in any other sense of the word.

He answers first, ‘This is only begging the question.’ Which is a term that he gives to any argument, when he has nothing else to say. He seems not to know what a ‘*petitio principii*’ is; for here is no sign of it.

But he says, I have contradicted this myself at another place, where I say, ‘God does by his Spirit at the time of *baptism* seal and apply to the infant that is there dedicated to him, the promises of the covenant of which he is capable, viz. adoption, pardon of sin, translation from the state of nature into a state of grace,’ &c. [vol. i. p. 175.]

He understands no better what is a ‘contradiction,’ and what not, than he does a ‘*petitio principii*.’ To say, that an infant may be regenerated by *baptism*, or *at the time of baptism*, by such graces or favours of God as I there mentioned, [vol. i. p. 49.] bestowed on him in that sacrament; but is not capable of it in any other sense of the word, than as it signifies the *grace of baptism*, is nothing like a contradiction. Especially when I added at that very place (what he in reciting my words omits)——‘in any other sense of the word than as it signifies baptism; I mean, the outward act of baptism accompanied with that grace or mercy of God, whereby he admits them into covenant, though without any sense of theirs.’ His

*epiphonema*, 'How came Mr. Wall to be so overseen, as to say,' &c. returns on himself. And this argument alone, without fetching proofs of the meaning of the word *regenerate* from other places, sufficiently proves that it must mean *baptized* here; because none of the modern notions of the word can be applied to *infants*.

I have done with his objections against that sense of the word; and must take notice of an omission of his. I there cited the sayings of several Fathers, Gregory Nazianzen, St. Hierome, St. Austin; which do exclude any conversion, repentance, &c. that is not accompanied with baptism, from being signified by the name of *regeneration*. Such sayings as these; Gregory says; 'There is not 'another *regeneration* to be had afterward [after baptism], though 'it be sought with never so much crying and tears.' Though the next words do shew 'there is *repentance* after baptism.' St. Austin, speaking of sins after baptism says, 'Such are not to be done away 'by *regeneration*; but by some other way of cure.' And some more such.

Now for Mr. Gale to write forty pages, as he does here, of 'reflections' upon a chapter of mine, which had but four and a half in all; and yet say nothing to those quotations that nailed the matter closest, is like the '*notæ variorum*' on some books, which explain largely all the easier passages, but let the hardest alone.

And I must also needs tell him, that such ways of answering books as he takes, to fill so many pages with an answer to so few, (as we are now at his four hundred ninety-eighth [three hundred and eighteenth] page, in answer to my twentieth [forty-ninth,]) are what we use to account cowardly. His book goes no farther in any methodical way of answering mine, than to the first two chapters, (which I owned had no *express* mention of infant-baptism,) and three more. He speaks of somebody that is to write a full answer to it<sup>d</sup>. If they write in his long declaiming way, the book will be unanswerable indeed; not for the strength, but for the bulk of it: as the Turks conquer their enemies, by thrusting on so many of their men to be killed by them, as shall blunt their swords, and tire them out with killing.

Page 319. If nothing will do; but infants by the testimony of Irenæus must be baptized; he will dispute the last inch of ground; and question, who are *infants*. If *regenerate* do signify here, as it generally uses to do; the term *infant* must not. He says now, that 'the whole business between us is reduced to this; to deter-  
'mine the period of infancy.'

<sup>d</sup> [See above, p. 9.]

We thought we had known that ; that *infants* are persons below the age of reason, faith, &c. And he will not deny that to be the ordinary meaning of the word. But he will persuade us that Irenæus took the word in a sense by himself ; to denote not only such young infants as are incapable of knowing and believing the principles of Christian religion ; ‘not only those of two or three months, or years,’ &c. but to comprehend ‘such as can know, and believe, and make a profession of their faith.’ And that he may be noted for saying the most paradoxical thing that ever was said ; he says, ‘it may very well mean *only* such.’

He makes an attempt to persuade us, that *infancy* extends to fourteen years of age ; having found an odd sort of dictionary<sup>e</sup> that tells of somebody that used the word so. But he stands to it, that it reaches to ten years.

He does not produce any author that ever used to speak so. He brings indeed some quotations concerning certain cases, where in a general and indefinite way of speaking, the words πάσης ἡλικίας, *omnis ætatis, of all ages*, have been sometimes used by authors, where yet it is plain by circumstances they did not mean to include *infants*. And because they were not meant there ; he would have us think that Irenæus here, though mentioning expressly them among the rest that were baptized (‘Infants and little children, and boys, and youths,’ &c.) yet did not mean *infants* properly so called ; nor that any under ten years old were baptized. But those instances which he brings are very different ways of speaking from this. He finds Origen speaking of some who ἐκ παίδων καὶ πρώτης ἡλικίας ‘from their childhood and first age, are called to do the works,’ &c. Nobody by those words would understand *infants*. But Irenæus mentions them particularly.

He says, that Irenæus in his Epistle to Florinus, mentioning the time when he heard Polycarp, calls it the time of his πρώτη ἡλικία. That is a mistake. He does not use that word, (and if he had, it had been nothing to the purpose,) but παῖς ὢν ἔτι, ‘being but a boy ;’ and afterward, αἱ ἐκ παίδων μαθήσεις, ‘what we learn, when we are boys.’ But that is no otherwise than everybody speaks. Irenæus reckons here, under *boys*, little children ; and *infants* under them.

In short, Mr. Gale does not bring any thing that makes the least appearance that *infantes* in this place should mean any otherwise than it does in ordinary speech and everywhere ; except that observation which he makes at

<sup>e</sup> [Danet's Dictionarium Antiquitatt. Græc. et Roman.]



Page 320; which is indeed an acute one, though not solid. Irenæus, in reckoning the steps or periods of human age, happens to use five words and no more; *infants, little ones, children, youths, elder* (or mature) *men*: (it is likely he would have used more, if more words had readily occurred to him at that time:) which several steps of age Christ, he says, did in person go through, that he might *save* and *regenerate* all human persons of those several ages. And following on his discourse of Christ's age, in order to confute the Valentinian heretics, who said that he lived but one year after his baptism; he argues *ab absurdo*, that if that were true, then Christ at his baptism being but in the beginning of his thirtieth year, would have been but full thirty when he suffered; and so would have died being yet a young man, not arrived at a mature age: for at the age of thirty any one is counted but a youth, or young man; and that appellation of *a youth* continues, Irenæus says, till a man be forty. Then after the fortieth or fiftieth year one declines to an elderly age; which elderly age our Saviour, he says, was of, when he taught, or was a teacher. The words must be set down.

‘Quia autem triginta annorum ætas prima indolis est juvenis [1. ‘juventus] et extenditur usque ad quadagesimum annum, omnis ‘quilibet confitebitur. A quadagesimo autem et quinquagesimo ‘anno declinat jam in ætatem seniore[m]; quam habens dominus ‘noster docebat<sup>f</sup>.’

Now Mr. Gale,—because here are five periods named; and one of them, viz. that of *juventus*, youth, is mentioned by Irenæus at ten years from thirty to forty;—thinks that he would have measured all the rest so. And consequently the first of them, *infantes*, must have ten years allotted to it. And then his speaking of ‘infants regenerated,’ will (though *regenerated* do mean *baptized*) infer no more than this; that some infants, viz. some persons that were ten years old, were baptized. Which he thinks might be upon their own faith and profession; for that some children of ten years old might by the help of an early and careful education attain to such understanding, knowledge, and faith, as is necessary for adult baptism.

This calculation (beside that such consequences as he draws from it, would not follow from it, if it were true) has two faults.

<sup>f</sup> [Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 39. edit. Grabe, lib. ii. c. 22. sect. 5. edit. Benedict.—The Benedictine editor corrects Dr. Grabe's misconception of the construction of the

passage, and thereby shews that we have no occasion to adopt Dr. Wall's proposed change of *juvenis* into *juventus*.]

One, that Irenæus does not say what he makes him say. Mr. Gale says, that in Irenæus, '*juvenes* extends to between thirty and 'forty; *seniores* between forty and fifty;' and adds, 'As he has 'thus assigned ten years to each of the last two stages; nothing 'can be more probable than that the first three were of the same 'length.' Now this is indeed true for one of the stages he mentions; but not of the other. *Juvenes* he does speak of, as extending from thirty to forty; but says no such thing of *seniores*; as any one will see by the words. And indeed it were absurd. For though it may properly enough be said, that at forty a man loses the name of a *young man*, and begins to be a *senior*; it were nonsense to say that at fifty he ceases to be a *senior*. For that name will continue to him as long as he lives; though it be fifty years longer. And besides, even of that stage of *juventus* he speaks uncertainly whether it should be extended to forty or to fifty.

Another fault of it is; that whereas Mr. Gale concludes by parity of reason, from Irenæus' assigning ten years to *youth*, that he would have assigned the like number to each of the other four; there is not a parity of reason in it. For one of these appellations to continue ten years, is agreeable to common apprehension and the custom of speech. For the other to do so is not. We, and all people, after we have begun to call any one a *young man*, do continue to give him that name for about ten years. When any child is new-born, we give him for some time the name of an *infant*; but do not continue to call him so for more than two or three years. Nobody styles a schoolboy, or catechumen, an infant. Or if they do, it is counted a straining of the word.

Besides: these passages in Irenæus (that, where he uses the five appellations aforesaid, and that, where he speaks of youth lasting ten years) are not nigh one another. He does not number five periods, and then quickly speak of the length of one of them; but after other long discourse intervening, at the end of the chapter, (when probably he had forgot how many words for the periods he had used,) being got into a dispute, whether Christ died a young man or not, speaks of the limits which common use gives to the name of youth. This last is in that part of the chapter which Mr. Gale just now would have proved to be spurious.

This exception, concerning the meaning of the word *infant*, would have been read by a hundred people without much regard, if it had not had a casual effect upon Mr. Whiston. He is used to

ancient books and the phrase of them, too well to allow any of Mr. Gale's cavils against the book, or translation, or meaning of the word *regenerate*. But this device, of the division of the stages of man's life, and invention of a new set of *infants*, being surprising, pretty, and arithmetical, took with him so, as that he presently, from this place, and from something in the *Constitutions*, took the hint of a new scheme of doctrine concerning baptism, neither to be administered in infancy, nor put off to adult age, (as the words are ordinarily taken,) but to be given between them both. And he says of himself thus; 'This passage of Irenæus (as discoursed upon by the learned Mr. Gale) will be to me *ever* most remarkable; 'because it was the first occasion of my making the discoveries,' &c. *Ever* is a long time. There may some other new passage or criticism happen.

For shewing the emptiness of this, when it comes to be weighed, I must refer to what I said above in answer to Mr. Whiston; who pretended to explain the term *infants* in some other Fathers, as Mr. Gale has done in Irenæus. I there made it appear, I think, how unnatural that explication is here; and utterly impossible to be fixed on the words of other Fathers, where he pretends to fix it. How impossible it is likewise to suppose that children of ten years should be generally, or in any considerable number, capable of baptism on their own profession. How unreasonable it is to take the *infants* who, as Irenæus says, were baptized, or regenerated, to mean *only* those of about ten years old, (whom by this stretch of the word they will have to be so called,) with an exclusion of those who are certainly meant by the word. How Irenæus does not merely name *infants*, but adds such epithets as must include the youngest infants; 'All whom he came to save' (which particular, I see, Mr. Stokes also has observed upon this quotation, and has well enforced); and some other things which I there noted.

What I have to add is, that in reading Irenæus since, I have minded that in several places (in all where I can find the word) he takes the word *infant* in the same sense as we and all others do. And I know no other way to be sure of the meaning of any word in any author than to do as I did with the word *regenerate*, viz., observe how other writers of that time do use it; and how the author himself uses it at other places.

Tertullian and Origen lived at the same time with Irenæus; though he was older than either of them: and they both, though they differ from one another in resolving the question of infant-bap-

tism, yet do agree in stating of it, viz., who are meant by infants. Tertullian describes them, ‘such as cannot yet learn; nor know Christ; nor whither it is that they are brought, when brought to baptism.’ Origen’s word is, *Nuper nati parvuli, ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, new-born infants.* They neither of them seem to have any notion of Mr. Gale’s or Mr. Whiston’s infants. Much less can this be doubted of the following Fathers.

Irenæus himself uses the word *infants* (I mean his translator, who commonly keeps close to the very words of his author, and makes this the translation of *βρέφος*) in the case of a very young child, often; in the case of one of ten years old, never, that I know of.

Lib. i. cap. 11, when there is talk of the *vagitus* of new-born children, and the Greek is *ἀρτι γεννώμενα βρέφη*, the Latin is *infantes*.

Lib. iii. cap. 18, speaking of Christ, when forty days old, presented in the temple, he uses the word *infant*. And of the children murdered by Herod at Bethlehem, he says, ‘It was happy for them that they were born at that time; that he (Christ) while he was an *infant* might send before into his kingdom those infants slain upon his account, as martyrs,’ &c.

And, cap. 26, speaking of the child mentioned Isa. vii. 16, and reciting the words, *Butter and honey shall he eat, &c., before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good*; he says, ‘*Hæc signa sunt hominis infantis*; these are properties of a human infant.’

But above all, the place itself (as I see upon reading it over again) affords a plain token, that by *infants* he means there such as have not yet the use of understanding. For he makes a remarkable difference between the infants and the rest, in the words which he immediately subjoins to each of the several sorts of persons there reckoned up.

After he had said of all of them in general; ‘Sanctifying every age by the likeness that it has to him; for he came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are regenerated unto God; infants, and little ones, and children (or boys), and young men, and elder men.’ Then he runs them all over again particularly, (save that under the name of *parvuli, little ones*, he includes those also whom he had called *pueros, boys, (or children,)* and says of every sort, except the infants, that they had the benefit of *taking example* by the behaviour that Christ had shewn in those several periods of his age. The words are:

‘Therefore he went through the several ages. For infants, he



‘ was made an infant, sanctifying infants.’ That is all he says of them.

‘ To little ones, he was made a little one ; sanctifying those of ‘ that age.’ Now here he adds, ‘ And also giving them an *example* ‘ of godliness, justice, and dutifulness.’

‘ To young men, he was a young man ; giving an *example* to ‘ young men, and sanctifying them to the Lord.’

‘ So also to seniors, he was a senior ; that he might be a perfect ‘ master to all ; not only by teaching the truth, but as sanctifying ‘ the seniors also according to that age, being made an *example* to ‘ them likewise.’

There can be no reason why he should name the benefit of *example* to all the rest, who were capable by their age of taking or following an example, (not omitting the repetition of that word in any of their cases,) and should not say any thing of that benefit, when he speaks of the *infants* but this ; that the persons he meant by *infants* were not capable of that lesson of imitation, (as the rest were,) being not yet come to the use of reason.

This Mr. Gale should have taken notice of, (which appears in the place itself,) if he desired to know how Irenæus took the word ; and not have run to the end of the chapter, to find, by the space of the continuance of youth, who are infants. Especially Mr. Whiston should have examined the whole passage better, before he had changed his religion upon it.

Whereas in this recapitulation of the ages, he makes but four of them all, which he had just before expressed in five words ; it is manifest that he had nothing in his mind of the nicety they dream of, to divide by those five words a man’s age into five decads ; but used the words, more or fewer, as they occurred to his mind. So that this ten years’ infancy, as built on his words, is a groundless whimsey.

What Mr. Gale, p. 321, quotes from St. Austin, of a boy dying at seven years old, of whom his sister, a martyr, had dreamed, that she saw him carried to heaven ; and St. Austin had a question put to him, how that could be, since there was no appearance in the story that he had been baptized, (the father being a heathen ; ) and St. Austin’s answer, That possibly the thing was not true ; or if true, it was not impossible that he might have been baptized by his own choice : Mr. Gale should have either told all the story as I (from whom he had it) did, or none of it. For it is one thing for a man, when he is put to a plunge in a question concerning an odd case, to say, ‘ Such a thing is not impossible ;’ and a very different

thing, to think it to be ordinarily practicable. Irenæus does not speak of some one infant that was baptized, but of infants indefinitely as being ordinarily *regenerated* (or *baptized*).

---

### CHAP. XIII.

I HAD desired the favour from any of my readers, that if they lighted on any passage in any author of those times, making *for* or *against* infant-baptism, which I had missed, they would be so kind as to let me know it. Mr. Gale thinks he has found one, which he sends to me in print.

[P. 323.] Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, about *ann. Dom.* 190, (who probably had Christian parents, for there had been seven of his kindred bishops,) says in a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, ‘that he was now sixty-five years old in the Lord.’

Mr. Gale thinks that expression ‘*in the Lord*’ plainly distinguishes ‘between his natural age and his age in the Lord.’

They are distinct in the nature of the things, for certain. And if Polycrates was not baptized in infancy, they must have been distinct in time by a considerable number of years; and he must have been now above eighty in all. But if he was baptized in infancy, his years from his natural birth, and his years in the Lord, ran parallel.

The question then remains, how old he was now in all; and whether he was baptized in infancy. And that is the question we began at; and Mr. Gale has nothing to say to it. If he was but sixty-five in all, (which is most probable,) he must have been baptized in infancy.

I did consider of this bishop’s case, and another, something more to the purpose than this, viz., Polycarp’s, when I was writing. They seemed to me (as for what weight they have either way) to make most *for* infant-baptism. But the arguments from them being not conclusive, I chose to omit them. But since he has proposed to consideration that which has the least weight of the two, I will mention the other.

Polycarp, constituted bishop of Smyrna by St. John, and who was probably that *angel* of that church, to whom the letter of Christ in the Apocalypse is directed, was martyred there *anno Domini* 147, as bishop Pearson has demonstrated the time. The proconsul offered him his life, ‘if he would curse (or revile) Christ.’ He answered,

‘Eighty-six years I have served him, and he never did me ‘wrong,’ &c.

Now Mr. Gale must choose whether he will suppose him to have been fifteen or twenty years old, before he entered into the service of Christ, (i. e. before he was baptized,) and so above a hundred now, (which is not probable, since the history written by his people that saw him die shews him to have had considerable strength of body at that time;) or else, that his *service*, or dedication to Christ, began in his infancy, i. e. that he was baptized then, and was now but eighty-six years old in all. Whichsoever it was, it was early in the apostolic age. He must have been in that bishopric about fifty years. For St. John, who placed him there, had been dead forty-six. His Christianity, and probably his life, began twenty-seven years after our Saviour’s death. If his birth was twenty years before his baptism, he must now be a hundred and six years old, and must have been born but seven years after Christ’s passion.

When I came in chapter fourth to speak of Tertullian and Origen, I gave the English reader some account of their character; that they were both very learned men, but both inclined to be singular in their opinions; and accordingly both fell into great and monstrous errors in the faith. And I instanced in the errors of each. But I said, they might however be cited as witnesses of the practice of the church in their times. Mr. Gale, at

Page 324, tells his *sir*, that I ‘begin with lessening Tertullian’s ‘reputation;’ and intimates that to be an artifice of mine, because his opinion was against infant-baptism.

If that *sir* of his be a schoolmaster, he will commend his scholar for this. For though the thing that I said be a known truth; a schoolboy in his declamation must put the colour of false upon it, because it is his exercise and trial of skill; as a lawyer does in his pleading, because it is his trade. But is this fitting, where one seeks the truth in a matter of conscience? Is not the thing I said notoriously known to all men of reading? Was not *Montanism* as blasphemous an heresy as most of that time? Did not I advertise this in the case of Origen, who is *for* infant-baptism, as well as of Tertullian, who would have it left off in children that were not in present danger of death?

I mentioned Tertullian’s speaking inconsistently with himself. As, at some places, if a person not yet baptized be ready to die, a layman must do the office of baptizing him; else he will be guilty of the person’s perdition, or damnation. That it is ‘a standing ‘rule,’ that none can be saved without baptism, grounded on that

sentence of our Lord, *Except one be born of water, he has no life.* And he inveighs against some that said, 'Baptism was not necessary ' for those that have faith; faith is sufficient,' &c.

At other places he advises several sorts of people to delay baptism. Infants till they are grown up; and then farther till they are married; and if they do not marry, or their consort die; then farther, till the danger of lust is over. And to encourage them, says, (the very thing he had condemned before,) 'An entire faith is ' secure of salvation.'

Mr. Gale would salve the contradiction by supposing that what he says of the necessity of baptism to salvation, is meant only in the case of adult persons; as many general sentences in Scripture are.

Then however, as to adult persons, such as widowers, widows, virgins, and all unmarried persons, he contradicts himself. But as to infants also; at one place his sentence is; 'What need their ' *guiltless* age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?' In another book he determines, that all infants of heathens are unclean. And infants of Christians are *holy*, or *saints*, only inasmuch as they are 'designed for holiness,' or saintship: for that the apostle, who calls them so, knew well enough what our Lord had determined; *Except any one be born of water, &c., he shall not enter, &c.,* 'that is,' says Tertullian, 'he shall not be *holy*, or a *saint*.' And he concludes; 'Thus every soul is reckoned as in *Adam*, so long till it be enrolled ' in *Christ*; and so long unclean, till it be so enrolled; and *sinful* ' because unclean.' That infants before baptism are *sinful* and yet *guiltless*, is a contradiction too plain.

It is in vain for Mr. Gale to recite, as he does here, several propositions expressed universally, in which yet infants are not meant. For Tertullian is here speaking of their case particularly; of the state of their birth from Adam. And applies to them, even to the seed of the faithful, that sentence of our Lord, John iii. 5. He states the case of their birth thus: heathen men's infants are unclean by birth; Christian men's infants, though they have an advantage by birth, yet till baptized, are not *holy*, or *saints*. This appears plainly his decision, to any one that reads the places I there produced. Some divines go a shorter way, and say, they are *born holy*.

Page 325. To the argument of the paedobaptists, that Tertullian's words, even while he brings his objections against infant-baptism, do shew that it was practised by the church at that time, Mr. Gale



answers; 'that it at most only proves, there were some persons at that time, who among many other wild notions were *about* to introduce this. Not that it was the opinion of the church, or that they practised infant-baptism.'

Does not Tertullian plainly ask, why they *did* it? Does he not mention the godfathers, &c.?

Mr. Gale says, 'Had it been the settled practice, &c., it cannot be imagined that Tertullian should venture to oppose it.'

Why not? Why might he not have the confidence and self-opinion that Mr. Gale has now, when it is undoubtedly the settled practice? He knows well enough, (though he would conceal it from any ignorant reader,) that that is Tertullian's character among all men; to oppose his singular opinions to the practice and tenets of the church of his time. He never saw an edition of his works without a large catalogue of his *paradoxa*. If there had been any church in Tertullian's time (especially at or near Carthage, where he lived) that had not practised infant-baptism, St. Cyprian, and his fellow-bishops, who fifty years after being assembled at that place, had a question put to them concerning the baptizing of a child before the eighth day, would have had some among them (one at least of the sixty-six) that would have remembered it; and would have been less positive, that it must, if in danger of death, be baptized before the eighth day; and that the salvation of the child did depend upon it. Some of these bishops must have lived there in Tertullian's time, which was but fifty years before. But St. Cyprian says, there was not one of the sixty-six but what held the baptism of it necessary. By which we may be sure that the contrary tenet was Tertullian's singular opinion.

St. Austin also was a bishop in the same province. He had not heard of Tertullian's opinion; (for he says, he had never read or heard of any that denied the baptism of infants to be for forgiveness.) He could not have missed of hearing or knowing it, if it had been so lately the practice of that church wherein himself was conversant. It is possible that one single man's opinion may be unheard of or forgotten; but not the general practice of a church. These things Mr. Gale saw largely made out, and the quotations of their sayings in my book.

As to the question, whether Tertullian would have the baptism of infants delayed only in case of no danger of death; I shewed that to be the explication of his words given by several of all parties; Vasquez, Baxter, Tombes, Danvers; and I think by all, till

Rigaltius set forth an edition of his works, and left out the words 'si non tam necesse.' Which were in the first edition that ever was printed, and in Pamelius' edition.

Mr. Gale [p. 326.] says, that Rigaltius in his first edition, 1634, gives for a reason of his omitting them, that 'the copies differ.'

He says no such thing in his second edition, 1640<sup>s</sup>; nor gives any reason at all. And if in his first (which I have not) he give only those general words, and do not name the particular copies, which leave out that clause, we know not of what credit they are. He that alters the text in any book ought to give good reasons or authorities for so doing; especially if he be a man that otherwise appears to have a bias for a side; as I, and not only I, but much greater men whom I quote, have shewn Rigaltius in this case to have; though nobody denies him his deserved reputation of great learning.

Mr. Gale says, 'Pamelius had it only from Gagnæus.' Whom should the succeeding editors of books have their authority from, but from the first editors? Rigaltius had his, as far as appears, from nobody at all<sup>b</sup>.

Mr. Gale treats the sentence, if it have those words, 'Quid enim necesse, si non tam necesse?—What need is there, except in case of necessity?' as absurd.

<sup>a</sup> [Nor in his *first*. See the note above, p. 326.]

<sup>b</sup> [With reference to this passage of Tertullian, adduced by Dr. Wall in vol. i. p. 61, objected to by Mr. Gale above p. 327, and here defended,—I have examined all the editions of that Father which I could meet with, and subjoin the readings of each as follows:

1. The *first* edition of the author, folio, *Basilee*, 1521, by B. Rhenanus, does not contain the treatise *De Baptismo*.

2. Edit. Jo. Gagnæi, fol. *Parisiis*, 1545, reads, 'Quid enim necesse si non tam necesse est sponsos etiam periculo integri' (sic).

N. B. This is the earliest edition containing the treatise *De Baptismo*, which, with several others, Gagnæus printed from a manuscript belonging to the antiquary John Leland.

3. Edit. S. Galenii, fol. *Basilee*, 1562, omits the disputed clause.

4. Edit. Renati de la Barre, fol. *Parisiis*, 1580, omits the clause, observing in a note that the MSS. vary.

5. Edit. Pamelii, fol. *Frankeræ*, 1597, contains the clause; and in his notes the editor defends it, not only by the

authority of Gagnæus, but by a manuscript.

6. Edit. (Pamelii repetita, fol. *Paris*. 1598,—follows the preceding.

7. Edit. De la Cerdà, 2 voll: fol. *Parisiis*, 1624, 1630, contains the clause, and defends it, from MSS.

N. B. The first volume of this edition sometimes wears a reprinted title, with the date of 1641.

8. Edit. Rigaltii, fol. *Parisiis*, 1634, omits the clause, but has not a word of observation upon it.

9. Edit. Rigaltii repetita, fol. 1640. Dr. Wall quotes in the text. I have not seen it.

10. Edition of the notes of Pamelius adjusted to Rigaltius' edition of the text, fol. *Paris*. 1635, contains the clause, and defends it, from the early editions.

11. Edit. Pamelii repetita, fol. *Rothomagi*, 1662, contains, and defends it, as before.

12. Edit. Priorii (Le Prieur), fol. *Parisiis*, 1664, 1668, or 1675, omits it: and does not notice the variety of reading on the place.

13. Edit. Semleri, 8vo. *Hallæ*, 1770, &c., omits the clause in the text, but prints it as a various reading.]

But that is his arrogant way. Tertullian says a little before, of lay-baptism, that there is no need of it, except in case of necessity. And Mr. Gale might burlesque that saying just as he does this.

He says here, that I have it from bishop Fell, that Tertullian was as much against the baptism of unmarried persons as of infants.

I think he dreams. What need I have from bishop Fell that for which I recited Tertullian's own words? The very next words to his dissuasive from baptizing infants are, 'Non minori de causa,' &c. 'For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be kept off.' Mr. Gale says, 'He opposes that upon quite different topics.' I grant it; but he says, the topics or reasons for one are as good as for the other. Indeed neither of them good for any thing. Would any man paraphrase, (as Tertullian does,) *Suffer little children to come to me*, 'i. e. Keep them away, because they are as yet little children?'

Pages 326, 327, he recites some sayings of Tertullian, and some of Scripture; which speak of some properties and advantages of adult-baptism, which cannot indeed be applied to the case of infants at the time of their baptism.

But this does not at all prove that infants can have no spiritual advantages by baptism; though they have not all the very same with the adult. Tertullian says, 'Baptism is the seal of faith,' &c. Does not Mr. Gale remember that St. Paul says just the same of circumcision? *a seal of the righteousness of faith*. The descants he makes upon this will as soon prove St. Paul denied infant-circumcision.

Ibid. Whereas I (having prepared a collection of the interpretations given by the ancients of that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, most of whom do interpret the holiness (or saintship) there spoken of, to be baptismal holiness) did here observe that Tertullian in one of the places here cited, viz., *de Anima*, c. 39, 40, does so interpret it; only he differs from the rest in that he thinks the apostle speaks of that baptismal holiness, not as then belonging to the infants when born, but designed for them. Having cited this place, as saying, that of either parent *sanctified* (or Christian) the children that are born are *sancti*, *saints*, (or *holy*,) he corrects himself; and says, the apostle there by his word *sancti*, *saints*, would have us understand, *sanctitati designati*, *designed* by their parents *for saintship*; and I said, his words here do shew that he means, 'when they come to be baptized:—'

Mr. Gale here answers, 'I do not see Tertullian gives any intimation that he understood this passage to relate to baptism at all.'

I suppose he thought the reader might want one instance more of the laudable faculty he has of manfully denying things that are before his face. Tertullian having said that by *sancti*, *holy*, in that text, must be meant *sanctitati designati*, gives for his reason; that the apostle 'meminerat Dominicæ definitionis, &c., knew well 'enough what our Lord had determined, *Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter,*' &c., that is, says Tertullian, 'non erit sanctus, he shall not be holy.' This is what our author could not see. Or else he must deny (as Calvin did) John iii. 5, to relate to baptism at all. Which the antipædobaptists have not yet been so absurd as to do. And Mr. Gale himself does often speak of it as meaning baptism.

Page 327. Whereas I had at another place of my book, viz., chap. II, recited a great part of Gregory Nazianzen's oration *de Baptismo*, (where he frequently uses the word *sanctification* for *baptism*, and *sanctified* for *baptized*), and had observed that he does the like in other orations; and that the ancients generally (both those before Nazianzen, of whom I cited there Cyprian, and here Tertullian; and those in and after his time; St. Austin, St. Hierome, Paulinus, Pelagius, &c.,) do so use the word; and had shewn that in several places of Scripture it is so taken; and had referred to Mr. Walker, who has filled a good part of a book with such quotations; and indeed they would fill a volume. So that it is no wonder that the ancient exposition of 1 Cor. vii. 14, should render *has been sanctified*, by 'has been brought to Christianity and 'baptism,' and *holy*, by 'Christian and baptized;' since it was their common phrase in all their writings, speeches, and sermons: —

Mr. Gale answers, first, that I produce none of the first three hundred years, who do so explain that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

I produced Tertullian, *anno Domini* 200, and St. Cyprian, *anno* 250. The one confessing the sense of that text to be, that children of Christians are not born actual *sancti*, *Christians*; nor can be called actually so, till baptized. The other saying directly, that an infant is in baptism *sanctified*, or made a saint, or Christian. And to them that take the words so, the text explains itself. Read it so far right, and you cannot read the rest wrong. Besides, that the current interpretation of the times a little after confirms that sense in the former.

He says again, the word *sanctify*, in the Old Testament, does



often signify other things beside *washing*. Which I grant, and did there give St. Austin's distinction between the *visible* sanctification and the invisible. But he cannot deny that in the places I mentioned, and abundance more, it does signify *washing*: nor that in the New Testament the word ἅγιοι, when it is applied to persons, (as it is in this text,) means *saints*, i. e. *Christians*; and ἡγιασμένοι, *those that have been sanctified*, means such as have been entered into the Christian covenant, or religion, by baptism; generally and almost without exception.

That expression of the apostle, *The unbelieving* (or *an unbelieving*) *husband has been sanctified by his wife*, which I after the ancients do paraphrase, 'has been converted, brought to the faith, and so to 'baptism,' (and so *saved*, as the following words are;) he says, why may it not be read, 'has been prevailed on to forsake his former 'vices and irregular course of life, and so saved?'

He does not care how palpably he perverts the scope and aim of the apostle's discourse. Do not the very words of the text lay the stress of the change from *unbelieving* (or heathen) to *believing* (or Christian)? and does not a Christian wife *save* her husband by bringing him off from *infidelity* to Christianity.

The *quare* put by the Corinthians to St. Paul, was not whether a godly wife should separate from a husband of ill morals; but whether a *Christian* wife should go away from a *heathen* husband. For a wife by her persuasions to reduce a husband, heathen or Christian, from his irregular courses to sobriety, is a good thing; but it is not the thing spoken of in this text.

Here he cites a place where Origen mentions this case of a woman converting her husband, or *e contra*. But he betrays a shameful degree of partiality, or else of ignorance, in translating it; and in saying, it is 'thus Origen seems to understand it.' *Thus*; that is, (as Mr. Gale had in the preceding paragraph explained it,) the believing wife *sanctifies* and *saves* her husband (not by making him a Christian, but) by 'prevailing on him to forsake his former vices 'and irregular course of life.'

Whoever views the place in Origen, or reads but so much of it as Mr. Gale himself has transcribed of the Greek, will see a notable pattern of warping. For the sense is as directly contrary to his 'thus,' as one thing can be to another.

I thank him for finding it for me. For here Origen (who is another within the three hundredth year) paraphrases this text of St. Paul exactly to the same sense as I shewed St. Austin and Pelagius, &c. to have done; and keeps the emphasis which most of

the modern translations and expositions have lost. I will transcribe it here; though it must have a place also in the *Appendix*, I promised, of quotations to be added to those in my *History*. For a quotation that translates this text right, is as much to the purpose as one that expressly speaks of infant-baptism. The occasion and context of the words may more fitly be set down there. But the words are, Comment. in Matth. p. 332. [edit. 1668.—tom. iii. p. 608. edit. Benedictin.]

Ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ πρότερον πιστεύσας τῷ χρόνῳ, σώζει τὴν γυναῖκα· ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἀρξαμένη ὑστερόν ποτε πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα. ‘Of a husband and wife, both unbelievers, ‘sometimes the husband believing first in time saves his wife: and ‘sometimes the wife believing first, does afterward persuade her ‘husband.’ Mr. Gale translates it, ‘When the husband believes ‘first, he *sometimes* saves his wife: and when the wife believes first, ‘she persuades her husband.’ He leaves out the first words, Ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς, ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, ‘When a husband and a ‘wife are both unbelievers;’ which regulate the sense of the following words; and plainly shew the conversions spoken of in them to be from *unbelief* to *Christianity*. This I do not call *ignorance*, but something worse. In the remaining words, (which himself sets down,) that he should not understand that ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ, and ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνή, should have been rendered, *sometimes* the husband, and *sometimes* the wife, looks very like ignorance. In the former clause, he (though he had the Greek before him, and wrote it down) follows the Latin; where some printer or compositor has transposed the words, (for Huetius was not capable of such blunders,) and instead of ‘*aliquando vir qui prior credidit, uxorem servat,*’ has printed, ‘*vir qui prior credidit, uxorem aliquando servat.*’ But in the latter clause, where the ‘*aliquando*’ is set right, (‘*aliquando ‘autem initium faciens uxor,*’ &c.,) he has followed neither the Greek nor the Latin.

Origen, we see here, understands St. Paul’s words of an unbelieving husband being *sanctified* and *saved* by his wife; and of an unbelieving wife *sanctified* and *saved* by her husband; to be meant, of the one being converted from *unbelief*, being made a *Christian* (or as St. Paul’s common word is, a *saint*) by the means of the other. Which, added to what I and others have cited from other Fathers, confirms this to be the current interpretation given to this place by the ancients.

He does not here go on to the following words, *else were your children unclean, but now they are saints*, (or holy,) as not being

pertinent to the matter he was discoursing of. But he that went so far as to paraphrase *ἡγίασται* in the former part of the verse, ‘has been made *ἅγιος*, a saint, a Christian,’ could not miss of translating the last words, *ἐπεὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι*, *else would your children be unclean*, i. e. kept in the heathen state, unbaptized; *ὡν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν*, *but now they are saints*, i. e. Christians; which can be meant no otherwise than by being baptized into Christ.

I have endeavoured to make this sense of that text plain, in a little piece which I believe Mr. Gale has seen<sup>i</sup>. But he, who had so openly accused me of giving up all proof from Scripture, could not with any credit own the sight of it. And indeed shames himself by letting his reader see by one attack before, and this a second one, upon my argument from this text, that I had not omitted all the proofs from Scripture.

He says at last, that ‘Dr. Whitby and bishop Burnet are very accurate in proving, that the words, *now are your children holy*, do speak only of *seminal* holiness.’

Yet, as much as he worships those two men, he says in his *Contents*, ‘their sense cannot be the true one.’ And he tells them, their argument for infant-baptism from *seminal* holiness is a *petitio principii*. By which I should guess that they have said something beyond his reach; for that is the common name that he gives to all arguments that he cannot answer.

I remember something of that sort of argument from seminal holiness. But, as I never used it, it is not my present business to defend it. Let those that will, derive their children’s saintship from their own. I question whether it be a rule in the heavenly city, (as it is in some cities here,) that a man may claim his freedom by his father’s copy. A parent that has an infant child like to die may, if he please, say to God; ‘Thou wilt save this child, because he is mine, and derived from me.’ I had rather have it to say, ‘because he is Christ’s; dedicated to him; and cannot be saved but for his sake.’

If this doctrine be true, David had ill luck in his conception and birth, to be *shapen in iniquity*, and that *in sin his mother did conceive him*; when these fathers can beget their children in *seminal holiness*, and their mothers *conceive them in saintship*. Yet I do not dislike that sentence of Mr. Baxter, where (as I cited him) speaking of a child dying before actual baptism, he says, ‘Believing that our heart-consent and dedication qualifies infants for a covenant-right before actual baptism.’ A devout dedication of a child to Christ,

<sup>i</sup> [Namely, ‘A Conference on the subject of Infant-baptism,’ described above, p. 469.]

to be received into his covenant of forgiveness and regeneration, joined with a sincere purpose of sealing this by baptism, may, we hope, (though the child be suddenly snatched away,) be accepted by God for the deed.

Page 329. He would retrieve the credit of that exploded interpretation of this text given by some antipædobaptists; *sanctified by the wife*; that is, says he, *to the wife*, meaning, for the use of the bed; so as that he, though an unbeliever, is not an adulterer to her; nor she a harlot to him. And the children are *holy*, i. e. *not bastards*. And he is so void of shame as to say, twice in one page, that this explication is built ‘on my principles.’

My principle is, that St. Paul by the word *ἅγιοι*, *saints*, or *holy*, when applied to persons, does always mean *Christians*. And by *ἡγιασται*, and *ἡγιασμένοι*, does always mean such as have been made or are become *Christians*; and that he never styled an unbeliever *a saint*, or *sanctified*. Mr. Gale’s exposition would have St. Paul to mean, that the unbelieving wife, or husband, continuing such, is *sanctified*. But St. Paul explains *ἡγιασται* in the fourteenth verse, by *saved* in the sixteenth. Does Mr. Gale think that *saved* means nothing but *allowed the use of the bed*?

The *quære* put by the Corinthians to St. Paul was not, whether it were fornication for two such parties to cohabit; so that the children would be bastards. Nor does St. Paul answer it as he would do a question of lawful or unlawful; but only of expedient or inexpedient. If the question had been, whether it was a sin or not, he would never have said, *To this question I speak, not the Lord*; nor would have advised the Christian husband to cohabit with the unbelieving wife, *if she be willing to dwell with him*. The woman’s willingness to stay would not, if the question had been about fornication, have mended the matter.

Let Mr. Gale try how this bed-sanctification will fit Origen’s paraphrase, which he just now commended; which was, that sometimes the unbelieving wife is sanctified, saved, or persuaded by her husband, a believer; and sometimes the unbelieving husband by the wife, a believer. That is, we will say, sometimes the man is sanctified to his wife’s bed, and sometimes she to his. Nonsense. Whereas to say, sometimes an unbelieving husband is brought to Christianity by his wife, and sometimes the wife by the husband; and then, by the consent of both, the children are made *holy*, or *saints*, i. e. *Christians*, by baptism; is good sense, and a good reason why St. Paul should advise them to continue together.

In short, not only this explication of the antipædobaptists, but



all the modern ones that forsake the ancient interpretation, have this fatal absurdity; that they make St. Paul speak of the man, or the woman, and the children, as *sanctified*, or *saints*, without Christianity. Which he never did, nor would have done.

Page 329. Mr Gale asks, 'what can this holiness of the children be, that springs from the Christianity of the parents? The baptism of the parents cannot serve for the children.' True. But the Christianity of the parents may make them baptize their children. And then they are in St. Paul's sense *ἅγιοι*, *holy*, *saints*, or *Christians*.

Page 331. The passages which I produced from Origen do, as Mr. Gale confesses, speak 'directly and clearly' of infant-baptism. They speak of it as a known principle of Christians, and ordered by the apostles. And whereas Mr. Whiston having before his eyes the places themselves, has ventured to say, and to print, that it is not plain from them that the *infants* he speaks of were such as we commonly call so; but that his words may be understood of lads big enough to make catechumens; he could not have more shamed his eyesight. And it ought to be a warning to him, not to print any thing in such haste; for the words are, *nuper nati parvuli*; and *what sin could they have?*

Mr. Gale's only exception is, of the authenticalness of the passages, of which I had spoken largely; which the reader must seek, if he would understand the dispute between us.

He wonders that all the passages about infant-baptism should be in the Latin translations; and none in the Greek remains, which are, he says, larger than of any Greek Father before him.

The thing were no wonder, if it were so. Since he having written above twenty times as much as any Greek Father before him; the Greek remains, though larger than of those before him, are yet not the twentieth part of what were extant in St. Hierome's time; who, as I shewed, had read in the Greek his sentiments of infant-baptism.

Pages 331, 332. One passage which sir Peter (now lord chief justice) King brought from the Greek, and I from him<sup>1</sup>, Mr. Gale in many words labours to prove to be nothing to the purpose; as speaking only of new converts compared to *infants*. Neither did I, nor do I, positively maintain the contrary. I was the first that shewed the doubtfulness of the phrase. But whereas he puts into my mouth those rude expressions and reflections on that great man, of 'artful leaving out of words,' &c., let him take them to him-

<sup>k</sup> [See vol. i. p. 66, &c.]

<sup>1</sup> [At vol. i. p. 71.]

self; they are his natural talent. I said no such thing; but only acknowledged that that sentence by being compared with the following ones is rendered ambiguous.

I have since found a passage in the Greek, viz., Comment. in Matt. tom. xv., which speaks manifestly of infants in the proper sense, (for, to satisfy Mr. Whiston and Mr. Gale, it names those of one day old,) and, I think, shews plainly Origen's sentiments of the necessity of their baptism. I shall not transcribe it here, but in the *Appendix* I mentioned<sup>m</sup>. If it be allowed, it makes all my answer to the exceptions he here brings against the places in the *translations* needless. But as I had drawn up the substance of my answer to those his exceptions before I found that passage, and as it is the last trouble I shall have with him, I will not grudge the pains of transcribing that also, that both together may give the fuller satisfaction.

Pages 332, 333. Mr. Gale, not content with what I had owned, that Ruffinus (out of whose translations several of the passages which I brought were fetched) took a great liberty in translating; sometimes abridging, paraphrasing, &c., sometimes omitting, or altering a place where Origen had vented any of his singular and heterodox opinions; thinks it worth his while to get together and recite, not only all the censures of Ruffinus' translation that he could find in Huetius, Daillé, Du Pin, Tarinus, &c., but any thing that tends to discredit the translations of the Fathers in general. 'They have,' he says, 'a very bad name.' And where Grotius says, 'some pieces ascribed to Origen are not his, and some interpolated;' Mr. Gale, turning the word *some* into a *great deal*, would have us believe none.

One that had not read the works of these modern learned men, which he here cites, would think by this account that they had a much worse opinion of Ruffinus' translations than they had really. They, notwithstanding the fault they find with his paraphrastical way, do upon many occasions quote his translations, and depend upon them, as being Origen's sense in the main. And Mr. Gale himself, in the chapter before, viz. p. 302, (when he sought for evidence against Irenæus,) thought the Tractat. in Matth. (which is a translation of Origen of far less credit than Ruffinus' are) a good authority.

Huetius, who knew best of any one what credit was due to each translation, though he give the preference by far to those done by St. Hierome, yet he more than a hundred times recurs to those done

<sup>m</sup> [It is incorporated into the third and the present edition, forming sect. xi. of vol. i. chap. 5. p. 75.]

by Ruffinus, either to confirm or to explain the sense of some place in the *Greek* tracts on which he is making notes. And particularly when he is vindicating Origen against Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, (who accused him of a thing he was not guilty of, viz., the denial of original sin,) he does it by one of the same quotations, which I brought for proof of his holding infant-baptism. For Origen speaks there, and at other places, of both those points together.

I said, whatever Ruffinus might add of his own in his translations, he would not add any of this sort of sayings which express an acknowledgment of original sin; because he himself was inclined to the contrary opinion; as I have shewed plain enough, and Huetius more largely.

Of this Mr. Gale takes no notice. And he does wisely. For it renders all that suspicion which he would raise of Ruffinus' inserting these passages of his own head, utterly incredible.

Mr. Whiston, though he be engaged on the same side of the dispute with Mr. Gale, and had seen his objections, confesses, p. 40, of his *Primitive Infant-Baptism*, 'I think we may allow them in the main to be genuine.' And the worthy Dr. Grabe declared to me, that he had met with so many fragments of those lost pieces of Origen, quoted by *Greek* writers or in the *Catenas*, as do manifestly shew the *Latin* of Ruffinus to have been taken from them, though after a more loose and paraphrastical manner than is usual in a translator.

If there were found in these translations but one or but two places, and those in Ruffinus alone, that did speak of infant-baptism; there might have been some reason for this suspicion. But when they are found in several places, brought in on several occasions, in translations made by several men who were of several parties, and enemies to one another, (as Ruffinus and St Hierome were,) and upon no temptation; (for Mr. Gale himself will own that there was no dispute then about infant-baptism;) to say, that they be all forged, is a thing that will sink with no man that considers and weighs the reasonableness of any plea. And thus to except sometimes against the book, as in Irenæus; and sometimes against the translations, as here; is in effect to say that he will not stand to the voice of antiquity.

Of the passages cited, one is from the *Homilies on St. Luke*, translated by St. Hierome, which speaks to the same purpose as the rest. Mr. Gale having no other escape, fights his way through, and pelts St. Hierome with reproaches for a translator as bad as Ruffinus.

I had, from Erasmus, quoted St. Hierome's own words, that in that translation of the homilies on St. Luke he had 'changed no-

‘ thing ; but expressed every thing as it was in the original<sup>n</sup>.’ Here Mr. Gale,

Page 334, sends his ‘sir’ to ‘compare the translations with the ‘ originals ;’ and tells him what he shall find there.

He is either so very ignorant as to think, or else would have the ignorant reader think, that those homilies on St. Luke are extant in the original, (for of those he must be understood to speak ; or else it is no answer to what I said,) and that he had compared them. If they had been at all extant in the *Greek*, I must have been very dull to cite them in the *Latin*. Such homilies as are extant both in the original and in St. Hierome’s *Latin*, (as for instance, some on Jeremy,) answer so well to one another, that Huetius sets no other *Latin* over against the *Greek* than St. Hierome’s ; and where the *Greek* copies have some words vitiated so as to mar the sense, he very often corrects them in his notes by the *Latin*. The *Latin* shews what the *Greek* must have been ; and Huetius, who says, ‘ the *Latin* does in many places recede from the *Greek*,’ imputes that to the variation of the *Greek* copies since St. Hierome’s time. And bishop Pearson, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatiæ*, concludes that St. Hierome must have been very exact in the translation of the Homilies on Luke by this ; that Ruffinus, who had the original, and out of envy sought to find what faults he could in the translation, mentions no interpolation but one of two words, (*atque naturæ*,) which shews he could find no more.

Mr. Gale says, St. Hierome, in translating Eusebius’ *Chronicon*, and *De locis Hebraicis*, owns that he altered some of the chronology and geography.

That is quite another case. The skill in chronology improved by degrees. And for the geography of the Holy Land, St. Hierome, living on the spot many years after Eusebius was dead, might naturally come to know the names and circumstances of many cities and places there, which Eusebius had omitted or mistaken. And any one, that is able, does well to correct mistakes in those matters. Especially when he owns the alterations that he makes. But in matters of religion any thing that is new is faulty for being so ; and the perfection of it is, to keep close to the primitive patterns.

But Mr. Gale cites some sayings of St. Hierome, where he confesses that in the translation of some books even of Origen he had omitted what was bad or erroneous, and kept in only what was sound and useful.

But, *first*, that is not adding any thing. And *secondly*, there are

<sup>n</sup> [See vol. i. p. 67.]



two different aims in translating. And he at several times had both of them, viz., either to satisfy the curious what it was that Origen held (and in such cases he sets down all, sound or unsound); or to publish some tract or discourse of Origen for the use of vulgar Christians: in which if there were many useful things, and some unsound tenets, he did well to omit the latter. And this Mr. Gale should not call St. Hierome's 'confession' that he did so. He *pleads it* in his own vindication against those that accused him of disseminating Origen's errors. But even this is not adding any thing. And besides, in the Homilies on St. Luke, (which is the only book I quoted,) he declares he took the former course.

Mr. Gale [p. 333,] cites Mr. Du Pin, vol. i. p. 132, [or 100,] where, after he had given instances of Ruffinus' licentious way of translating some pieces, he adds, 'St. Hierome's versions are not 'more exact.' And there Mr. Gale cuts off the sentence; and makes much use afterward of this verdict of Mr. Du Pin against St. Hierome. Whether he do say just so, and do not add any expressions in abatement of what he had said, I know not. A reader that has Du Pin by him may do well to see<sup>o</sup>. But it is certain, the expression taken strictly is not true. St. Hierome may in some books have made some paraphrastical alterations, or omissions, (though none, he says himself, on St. Luke,) but not nigh so many as Ruffinus.

Mr. Gale tells us over and over again, that these translators 'do 'confess and own the alterations' they have made, and warn the readers of them.

There is then the more credit to be given them, when they say they have altered nothing. They do in some books of Origen own that they have left out many things that were unsound; and abridged some books that were too long (as Origen's style is indeed redundant); but there is no sign of their adding any thing of their own (except in those books where they declare they have supplied some particuliar chapters that were missing); I mean, not any material thing. Transitions they must make for the gaps where they left out any large passage. But this is nothing to the Homilies on St. Luke, in which St. Hierome says he altered nothing.

Of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (out of which one of the passages concerning infant-baptism is taken,) there are two fragments preserved in the Greek, viz., *Philocal.* c. 9. and c. 25.

<sup>o</sup> [The citation from Du Pin is made fairly. See his *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 100, both in the text and the note r, edit. 1692 or 1696.]

Mr. Gale tells us, twice over, that of that in c. 25, there are in Rufinus' version hardly any footsteps of the original preserved.

Suppose they had been both wanting in Rufinus; what wonder? Since, as I said, he professes that he had shortened that work by one half. All that can be argued from hence is, that as there is in that half which he has preserved one place that mentions infants' baptism, probably in the whole there were two.

And just such an advantage accrues to his argument from that which he quotes,

Page 336, of Rufinus, complaining that several volumes or tomes of this *Comment* were wanting, before he took it in hand, 'fere apud omnium bibliothecas,' (which he in translating augments to *all libraries*.)

This argument weighs backward. Therefore he, to make it turn the right way, does in the next page call this *deficiency* an 'interpolation;' which is quite the contrary.

Those two sentences of Rufinus, which Mr. Gale here recites out of the *peroratio* of his translation of Origen on *Epist. ad Romanos*, were not meant by him for any serious account of what he had done in that work; but for a jeer on St. Hierome, who had set out tracts in his own name, whereof all the substance was (as Rufinus would insinuate) taken out of Origen. So that Rufinus pretended, he might as well have called this translation, *Ruffini Expositio*, &c., as St. Hierome had entitled some works of his, *Hieronymi Libri*, &c., which were little more than translations of Origen. But he says, he would not get himself a reputation by such tricks of plagiary.

Though this appears by the sentence itself, and by his putting the name *Hieronymi* into it; and though Huetius (out of whom, I question not, Mr. Gale had it) do note the drift of it; yet he, like a true representer of things, sets down the sentences, but leaves out the note.

Page 336. Whereas one of the passages I cited was from Origen's Homilies on Joshua, ('Thou wast an infant, when thou wast baptized,' concerning the translation whereof I produced Rufinus' declaration, that he had in that translation neither added nor omitted any thing; but truly rendered what he found in the Greek books:—Mr. Gale would here prove Rufinus a liar; because in one part of a chapter (not that which I cited, but another) there is found the difference of a few words between Rufinus' translation, and a quotation of that part in the *Philocalia*.

But, first, the difference is of no moment. And secondly, there is no knowing by the *Philocalia* how the original was.

For their way, when they entitle a chapter as taken out of such or such a tome, is, after they have recited something out of that tome, to run to another tome where there is any thing to the same purpose, and then go back to where they left off. And this commonly several times in one chapter; as appears in all the *excerpta* which they have taken out of the books against Celsus; and would, no doubt, appear in the other, if the original of the other were extant, as it is of them.

Mr. Gale gives instances of some chapters in the *Philocalia*, which are there said to be transcribed from such or such a homily of Origen's on such or such a book of Scripture; whereof one shall not find any footstep in Ruffinus' *Latin*.

Huetius will tell him the reason of this. Origen composed several sets of sermons or homilies on the same book or epistle. One perhaps when he was young. Another volume of sermons on the same epistles when he was old. St. Gregory and St. Basil sometimes lighted on one of these volumes, Ruffinus on another. *Vide Huetii Præfat. in Origeniana*, p. 4.

They that can think that these passages concerning infant-baptism in the translations of Origen's works were put in by the translators, who lived but a hundred and fifty years after Origen's time; and yet do maintain, that in Origen's time there was no infant-baptism, do make them more absurd men than we can conceive them to have been. For the practice of the church could not have been changed from antipædobaptism to pædobaptism in that space of time, but that such learned men, as St. Hierome especially was, must have known it. Eusebius' Church History, written in the intermediate time, and translated by Ruffinus, must have taken notice of it. Or the very tradition from father to son must have carried a memory of it. And then, for them to make Origen several times over speak of a thing which all the world knew was not in use at his time, must have made them ridiculous.

Mr. Gale observes twice or thrice, how dipping of infants, in the ordinary baptisms in England, began about two hundred years ago to degenerate into pouring or sprinkling. It is true, it did so; but everybody knows it, and the time of it. And therefore he that should in translating a book written before that time, put in any thing of sprinkling as used ordinarily in England in the author's time, would be hooted at. The like would have been in the case of these men. If Ruffinus had first fallen into such a blunder, he would not have escaped the lash of St. Hierome. Nor if St. Hierome had been guilty, would Ruffinus have spared him. But the

contrary is true. For not only both of them do translate Origen so speaking of infant-baptism as being ordered by the apostles; but all of that time, St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, &c. that do speak any thing of it, speak of it as practised, not only in Origen's time, but from the beginning.

If Mr. Gale had been a candid inquirer after the truth in this question concerning Origen's holding or not holding the doctrine of infant-baptism; he would have taken notice of a passage in St. Hierome; who being the greatest reader of Origen's works in the original, of any Christian that ever was, brings in, in his discourse of him, such circumstances as do plainly shew, not only that he held it, but also built some of his particular tenets upon it.

And since his works (which were more than all the *Bibliotheca Patrum* that we have now) are lost, (the Greek of almost all; the translations of the greatest part,) suppose we could not be sure of the authenticalness of this or that passage in the translations, nor find any passage in the remaining Greek to that purpose; yet these two things concurring together, that there are several plain places in the translations, and a plain testimony from one that had seen the originals, that this doctrine was held by him, and was then visible in his books; would convince any body, except it be one that has a task set him to maintain the negative, and maintain it he must.

The passage in St. Hierome, which I mean, was in my first edition not set down in this fifth chapter which is concerning Origen, and which Mr. Gale is here answering; but it was in the nineteenth chapter, (which speaks of St. Hierome and the Pelagians,) § 26. And in the second edition I put a note of it into the fifth; because it clears up the doubt concerning Origen's holding infant-baptism. Mr. Gale, I doubt not, had seen both.

It is St. Hierome's jeering advice to the Pelagians, who were put to it how to give any good account of the reason of baptizing infants, since they would not own that they had any original sin or corruption. He in a mocking way advises them to march over to Origen's opinion; 'Qui præterita in cælis et antiqua delicta solvi dicit in baptismo.' 'Who holds that their sins committed in a former state, (the state of præexistence,) in the celestial regions, are forgiven them in their baptism.'

This is a plain proof that Origen did use to speak of infant-baptism; and that St. Hierome had seen the places where he did so; and that the doctrine of baptizing infants was current in his time; since he endeavoured to link his tenet of præexistence to it.



But we have found, as I said, in the original text of Origen a passage, which will, I think, clear up any difficulty that remains, and stop the mouth of all objections or evasions concerning the sense and practice of the church in his time; which was about *anno Domini* 210: after the apostles 110. The passage is so much to the same sense and purpose with those translated by St. Hierome and Ruffinus; the style and phrase so much the same; the same texts of Scripture quoted, &c. that it is not only itself an evidence, but also confirms those other to be genuine translations.

It shall be recited at large in the Appendix, which I think to set at the end of this Answer; meaning also to print a considerable number of them for the use of those who have the first or the second edition of my history.

My next chapter was quotations out of St. Cyprian, who flourished a hundred and fifty years after the apostles. Him, and his time, and all that comes after, Mr. Gale yields as practising infant-baptism. So that I wonder what work he means the man, who, he says, is to write an answer to my book, shall have. For he himself has in these 'Reflections' answered the first five chapters, to p. 78. And that, if we believe him himself, sufficiently. But if the other man be to answer all the rest, Mr. Gale has done ill to yield it all beforehand. What is the consequence of this concession, we will consider presently. But he throws in some disparagements of the men and times which he yields up.

Page 337. First, St. Cyprian speaks as plainly of infant-communion, as he does of infant-baptism.

Concerning this matter I have spoken three or four times in this answer; and also had shewed largely in my book, that there is no proof of mere infants (but only of children of four or five years old) being admitted to the communion in St. Cyprian's time; and that, except that time and place, there is no account (at least, that I know of:—I do there refer myself to such as had studied that point more; no account, I say) before the year *four hundred*, of children being admitted at all in any church. Of which since he will take no notice, I shall not repeat the same answer to all his *crambes*, but add this general reply:

That this is at best but an argument *ad hominem*. It is a question in the present Christian church, whether giving the communion to infants be an error or a duty. The present *western* Christians think

P [As was observed above, p. 621, this passage is incorporated into the present edition in its proper place, at vol. i. chap. 5. sect. 11. The *Appendix* spoken

of contained 25 pages 8vo. Its contents are all disposed in their due places, in the third and the present edition.]

it an error. The Greek church, which is, I think, the biggest half of Christendom, think it a duty. To these last, an argument against infant-baptism, drawn from the practice of those times which gave the communion as well as baptism to infants, weighs backward; and confirms the thing which it would overthrow. To us and all Christians hereabouts, it weighs but very little. It proves only that those churches and those times which did so were, in our opinion, in an error in one thing. Does that overthrow the force of an argument taken from their doctrine and practice in other things? It is not, in the opinion of any Christian, a *fundamental* error. If providence should place any of us in Muscovy, or any country of the Greek Christians, where this custom is used; we should not (do, as Mr. Gale, and *another*, would have the antipædobaptists and other dissenters do here) renounce their communion; unless we had some greater reason than that. There is no good argument to prove any thing, which does not prove it to one Christian, as well as to another.

Secondly, St. Cyprian he says was an African; and so were the sixty-six bishops whose testimony is joined with his; so that probably infant-baptism began in the church of Carthage.

Does Mr. Gale take his readers for such idiots, as to think a testimony is disparaged, because he can tell where the people that give it lived? So Origen lived at Alexandria; and Mr. Whiston thinks it began there. And Irenæus at Lyons in Gallia. By that account it began there. Those Christians, whose children, St. Paul says, were saints, lived at Corinth. And the places where he is mentioned to have baptized the whole households were all in Greece. Some perhaps will think it began there. But our Saviour, who commanded *little children to be received in his name*, was, according to the flesh, a *Jew*. So that the Christian baptism began there. Antipædobaptism began among the Alps, or in Germany. Will that be taken for a refutation of it?

Thirdly, 'The Africans were generally men of weak understandings. And St. Austin, another African, thought it an apostolical tradition.'

St. Austin concludes partly from proofs of Scripture; partly because it had been ever used from the beginning by all Christians, that it was '*apostolica auctoritate traditum*,' 'ordered (or delivered down) by the authority of the apostles.' Is there any thing in this whereon to ground a note of contempt upon St. Austin? Does not Origen say the very same in the places we were last speaking of? Can the antipædobaptists account it decent in their champion to

insult, as absurd, sometimes the present divines, sometimes the ancient Christians, for saying that which all Christians in the world say, and ever said, except themselves.

Page 338. For a parting blow, he has preserved a testimony against infant-baptism; which ought in policy to have been one of his best. He says, 'Though the African bishops were no wiser, &c. 'the Greek churches seem very plainly to have been still of another 'opinion.'

Here one would expect something that according to his promise should 'seem very plain.' It is this at last:

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, writing a letter concerning the character of Novatian, (whom he makes a monster of impiety,) says of him, after a great many worse things, that he did ἀθετεῖν ἅγιον λουτρὸν, 'make void holy baptism,' (which words Mr. Gale translating, adds a crime that he was never accused of, making him a Quaker; 'he utterly disallows of holy baptism,') and, τὴν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πίστιν καὶ ὁμολογίαν ἀνατρέπειν, 'subverts the faith and profession 'that goes before it.' Here Mr. Gale sets his thumb. Dionysius speaks of the profession of faith *going before* baptism.

Now this is a known thing; that a profession of faith was usual before baptism (I, after others, had spoken largely of it) in the case of persons baptized at full age, (as Novatian was,) made by themselves as the faith they then actually had; in the case of infants, made by their sponsors, as he might see in Tertullian, (for there were then no *presbyterian* baptisms without sponsors,) as the faith into which the infant was baptized, and in which he was to be instructed, and which he must hereafter hold and keep, if he expected any benefit by his baptism.

This was abundantly enough to make Dionysius say what he did. And is no more than any one would now say concerning such a case, that a Christian turning to wickedness or apostasy, renounces his baptism, and the profession of faith, that went before it. This might well enough be said even of one that was baptized in infancy, in respect to the profession made in his name by sponsors at his baptism. But Dionysius was now speaking of a man who was known to have been baptized at age. He represents him as one who, having been an infidel and a very wicked man before, and then in a fear of death desiring to be baptized, and in order thereto making the professions, and being baptized in his bed of sickness, had afterward been as bad as ever before. That was 'frustrating 'holy baptism, and perverting the faith and profession made before it.'

This is all that Mr. Gale has to prove that ‘the Greek churches were of another opinion’ than St. Cyprian and his dull Africans.

His clients must needs think this but a very indifferent plea to close their cause with. But he, to excuse himself, and put them out of hopes of any better from any other pleader, plainly tells them, they must not ‘expect to find any passages more inconsistent with that practice (the practice of infant-baptism) than this is.’

I do not love boasting, to the degree that he does. Yet this, I think, I may say; that I, though their adversary as he would represent me, produced several passages more plausible for anti-pædobaptism than this, or indeed than any he has brought; and those such as had never been made use of in that dispute before. I produced impartially all that I found.

As for Dionysius; there is a particular reason to satisfy us that neither he and his church of Alexandria, nor the church of Rome, nor that of Cappadocia, did take the doctrine and practice of infant-baptism to be any error in St. Cyprian and his church of Carthage. For all these (and indeed all the noted churches in Christendom) were engaged at that time in a question and dispute about baptism; not in any question whether infants are to be baptized, (of that, as I have often said, there was never any question made by any church nor by any man, except Tertullian, for a thousand years,) but in a question whether baptism received from the hands of heretics or schismatics was valid, or not. Cyprian of Carthage, Firmilian of Cappadocia, and many other bishops and churches said it was not; but that men baptized by heretics must, if they would be admitted in the church, be baptized anew; and they practised accordingly. Stephen bishop of Rome, and some with him, maintained the contrary. The contention increased to a great height, and lasted a long time. Councils were held on each side, in Europe and Asia, as well as in Africa. Many messages and letters sent. Stephen carried it so high as to renounce in great measure communion with Cyprian, Firmilian, &c. This Dionysius of Alexandria (whom Mr. Gale here would make an anti-pædobaptist) acted the part of a mediator, and wrote pacificatory letters, whereof good parts are preserved by Eusebius<sup>q</sup>.

Now I say, if the practice of baptizing infants, which is known to have been then used by the churches of Africa, had been at that time by any of the other accounted an error; it could not have missed of being censured, or taken notice of, in the dispute. When they

<sup>q</sup> [See his ‘Ecclesiastical History,’ book vi. chap. 40 to 46. book vii. chap. 26, &c. &c.]



were inveighing each against the other's mistakes about the nature and use of baptism ; Stephen, who reproached Cyprian for an abuse of baptism in one respect, viz. for giving it to men who had already a baptism which Stephen thought (though received in a blameable way, yet) valid, would also not have failed to have censured the abuse of it in this other respect, if he had thought the giving it to *infants* to be an abuse. But so it is, that in the whole dispute there is not one word said about it. A certain sign that there was no difference in their tenets and usages in that particular. So that the proof of the African church using it, and the silence of the rest, is a proof for all of them, that they used it; and for Dionysius and his church among the rest.

Page 338. Here he enters on the recapitulation, or summing up of what he has done : of the arguments he has used ; of the texts of Scripture he has explained or cited ; with which he has done, as he has with his table of authors. For as in the one he has given you the name and edition of every dictionary or school-book ; so in the other, if he has mentioned or occasionally referred or alluded to any text, he puts that text down in the *index* to fill up the number.

I shall not follow him in the recapitulation ; but leave him and his 'sir' (to whom he ever and anon addresses, 'you see, sir') to applaud and crow over their *egregia facinora et res præclare gestas* ; as knowing that whatever I may do with his arguments, I can never stop or quell his humour of boasting.

Instead of that, I crave leave to address myself in a few words to the antipædobaptists, and in a few to my brethren of the clergy.

The first, if they cannot from the evidence, and the pleas *pro* and *contra*, determine their opinion concerning the times of Origen, Tertullian, Irenæus, &c. should at least weigh in their minds the consequence that follows from this very thing that is granted concerning the practice of infant-baptism, viz. that it can be plainly traced up to St. Cyprian's time. The force and weight of the consequence or argument from thence does not lie, as Mr. Gale would represent, that it began in that time, but since it was not used from the beginning, we ought not to use it : but it lies thus ; that which we can plainly trace so far up, we have all reason to think was from the beginning.

We are now at above sixteen hundred years' distance from the time that all the apostles had left the world. Of these sixteen hundred, one thousand four hundred and fifty are granted and yielded. Not to mention now the improbable things which the deniers of it are forced to say, to stave off the evidence for one

hundred farther up—('The books are not genuine; such a part of 'the chapter is interpolated: they by *infants* do not mean as we do: 'the translations are not right; which is the plea that the papists 'use when we urge to them texts of Scripture,' &c.)—but to speak of the time that is yielded.

Of the sixteen hundred, the first two hundred (which, with the hundred years of apostolic times, make the first three centuries) are owned by all learned men of all persuasions to have been the most pure both in doctrine and practice. They that except against the canons, the councils, the customs, since Constantine's time, (when the empire turning Christian, the riches of the world came into the church, and by degrees corrupted it,) as not so safely to be relied on; do yet extol the purity of the first three centuries, (i. e. the time of Christ and the apostles, and two hundred years more,) when there was no temptation from the love of the world to warp men's consciences.

That which depraved the church, when it did come to be depraved, was the same place-hunting that has since depraved and ruined every particular church, and state too, that has been ruined; and will do more. But in the times we speak of, there was no place worth standing for; but that of a martyr, to make a glorious end of a life which would have been, as St. Paul says, *if in this life only they had hoped in Christ*, the most miserable.

Now the times of St. Cyprian, which are yielded, were far within that space, and in the midst of the persecution. He himself at the head of his people, and multitudes of them with him, and after him, (as many of them had done before him,) gave up their lives as a sacrifice to the testimony of the truth of our holy religion; butchered by the cruelty of their heathen governors in their hatred to the Christian name and doctrine; which they saw did by the constancy of such men increase, in spite of all their opposition.

These were the men whom Mr. Gale represents to you as 'the 'dull Africans.' And these were the times which he, at p. 246, would have you comprehend under the name of 'the more corrupt 'centuries.' If you were to read this holy martyr's learned works, and pious letters, you would be sufficiently angry with your advocate, for styling (as he does, p. 338) the letter he there speaks of, (which to read would be for your better information,) 'a trifling 'and empty reply.'

Honest men, that have, or think they have, an honest cause, hate to have it defended by pleas that are not true. He tells you in the next words, p. 338, that they used infant-baptism, 'perhaps only

‘ as an indifferent thing, or in cases of danger.’ I desire no other judge than one of yourselves, to see, by reading the place itself, where they speak of the necessity of it in terms as high and higher than we do now, if that be not as directly false a representation of it, as can be given by any man of any thing. He has undertaken to defend you. I desire you to defend him, if you can. And if you cannot, you know what you ought to do.

Mr. Danvers himself did not say but that this place spoke of infant-baptism as a thing, not indifferent, but necessary and ordinary. He thought of it (as Mr. Gale does now of Origen’s and Irenæus’ sayings) that it was forged. That thought, though it be so plainly confuted that such a plea will never be used any more, might at that time be his *mistake*. But to deny a book before one’s face to say what it does plainly say concerning the danger to the soul of an infant dying without baptism, is a thing that needs a better defence than that which saved Danvers.

Mr. Gale himself uses commonly to speak of the first three centuries as early times, and fit to be appealed to. But here, seeing this to be fifty years within them, would have it to avail nothing, unless testimonies be brought for the same practice within the other two hundred and fifty. And though that have been done, yet he knows how to get a verdict that it has not. It is but saying so positively, and four or five times over, p. 345, ‘ The authority of the ‘ primitive Fathers for at least two hundred and fifty years gives no ‘ countenance,’ &c. and then appealing to his ‘ sir,’ p. 346, ‘ You see, ‘ sir, there is indeed nothing in whatever they advance, which can ‘ in the least favour their opinion,’ &c.

But should he not mind, or could he think that you would not mind, that even this question and answer in a meeting of sixty-six bishops, at the year after the apostles a hundred and fifty, concerning the baptizing of an infant before the eighth day, does carry in it an evidence for seventy or eighty years higher? It cannot be thought but several bishops among so many were seventy or eighty years old, (which reaches up to seventy or eighty from the apostles,) and it is plain by the discourse, that not one of them had any doubt or question of baptizing in infancy; which yet they must have had, if it had not been in use ever since they could remember; or if they themselves (such of them as were born of Christian parents) had not been baptized in infancy. For St. Cyprian tells Fidus, that there was not one in all the number who doubted but that a child must be baptized before the eighth day, if need require. Much less then did they doubt but that they must be baptized in infancy.

Mr. Gale would have you conceive of St. Cyprian as an obscure bishop, of no greater converse than with his Africans. But it appears by his books and letters that he had great correspondence and communion with the most noted churches and bishops then in the world. In all which churches his memory was also afterward honoured, as of a glorious martyr.

Whereas Mr. Gale, at p. 346, would have you insist upon proofs within the first fifty years, or less: if he mean other than Scripture-proofs, he mocks you; and takes you for more ignorant than I hope you are. At the year of Christ fifty, i. e. after his ascension about seventeen, whether any book of the New Testament was written, is not certain. But for certain no other book of any Christian, of which we have any memory; nor in a long time after. And indeed very few are left, either of the apostles' times, (beside their own,) or of the hundred years following. The persecution and opposition against Christianity itself, hindered them from any leisure to write of any thing but the defence of the fundamentals of their religion. There is little in those few that remain about the rituals of it. Of those remains that are left, elder than St. Cyprian, I have told you what Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen do say; and intend to give in the Appendix a quotation or two out of Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>r</sup>; and do wish you could read the books yourselves.

When the world became Christian, (which was chiefly in the fourth century,) more books were written. And accordingly the testimonies are many, full, and undeniable. Neither does one of them speak of it as new, or as a thing that needed proof: but as of a thing supposed and ordinarily known. No council ever enacted it, or made canons to enjoin it; because no church or sect of Christians had ever denied it. On the contrary, they occasionally instance in it as a thing that had ever been.

Pelagius, who set up a sect that denied original sin, was galled with that argument of the catholics; 'Why are infants baptized for the remission of sin, if they have not *original* sin? *Actual* sins they can have none.' And some that aggravated his error, accused him of it, as a consequence of his tenet, that he pleaded against the baptizing of infants. He declared an abhorrence of the slanderous imputation; and said, they accused him of saying a thing which 'he never heard any Christian, no not even any sectary, say.'

And if there had ever been any church in any time, or any part

<sup>r</sup> [These quotations are incorporated into the work itself, forming the eighth and ninth sections of chap. iii. in the first volume.]



of the world, that denied infant-baptism, he must have heard of them. For he was a learned man; and had lived in the most noted churches of Europe, Asia, and Africa. And they had then but three hundred years, or under three hundred and twenty, to look back to the time of the apostles.

These, and many such decisive evidences, were in that part of my book, which Mr. Gale gives up and cannot deny.

Now this fourth century, in which Constantine the emperor became Christian, was none of the corrupt times of the church, nor the next century to it; I mean, not to any high degree. I said before, that the world with its pomps coming into the church, corrupted it by degrees, with ambition, factions, schisms, parties, &c. But that was not done to any high degree presently. It was that fourth century that had those shining lights, Constantine the first Christian emperor, Eusebius, Athanasius, St. Basil, the two Gregories, St. Hierome, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin, &c. These Mr. Gale himself, when he quotes them, styles *saints*; ‘St. Cyprian, ‘St. Basil, St. Gregory,’ &c. Do you think he accounts them saints? Does he allow them to be Christians? Will he own that there was any church of Christ at that time? Would he have held communion with the church then, or any part of it?

His answer, either affirmative or negative, will fly in his face, so long as he holds that uncharitable and unchristian opinion (which he has professed in this book of his, and which was the only one he could find to confront and defeat the exhortation I gave you against separating from the church, though you thought her to be in an error in points not fundamental); I mean his opinion and assertion, that paedobaptism is a *fundamental* error in the constitution of a church: that the age and manner of receiving baptism are of the *essence* of it: that baptism so given as the paedobaptists give it, not only is blameable in its circumstances, but ‘becomes no baptism:’ that persons so baptized ‘are not true members of the Christian church; ‘have no baptism; no title to church-membership; but should be ‘disclaimed; no more to be communicated with than one would ‘communicate with persons he cannot esteem baptized.’ These positions he maintains, p. 51, &c., to p. 53, and without any shame or modesty, pretends that I supposed all of them to be right. And he intimates worse, and speaks them as far as he dare; that the church of England has ‘no bishops, presbyters,’ &c.

Now I say, a man holding these desperately uncharitable positions could not have held communion with the church of the time we were speaking of. For in all that time, by all the footsteps

found in reading the numerous books then published, there is no appearance of any church, nay, not of any sect, but what were pædobaptists.

I know, you generally do not hold so uncharitable a tenet (but only he and some few). If you did, I would never advise you to come to church, nor any church to receive you.

St. Paul, when he spoke, 2 Thess. ii, of the *falling away*, or degeneracy, ἀποστασία, that should come in the church, or greatest part thereof, said; there was something that did then *let*, or *withhold*, i. e. put a stop to the coming of that *apostasy*, and to the *revealing of that man of sin, who should sit as God in the temple of God*, i. e. in the church, which he should defile. And he said that *that which did then let would let until it were taken out of the way*. And, that they knew what it was; for he had told them when he was present with them. That is, he had told them in private; it being not a thing fitting to be published. For it was the power of the Roman empire; of the destruction of which, or its being taken out of the way, it was not proper for St. Paul at that time publicly to speak or write. But it came abroad among the Christians afterward; and they knew what it was, that he had told the Thessalonian Christians, viz. that when the Roman empire should be destroyed, then that wicked should be revealed, &c.

Now that empire was not destroyed at once; but by degrees. And accordingly some modern divines have placed the beginning of the apostasy sooner, some later: but none so soon as the end of the fourth century; in which (or before which) lived all the Fathers that I cited speaking so fully and plainly of infant-baptism, that Mr. Gale yields St. Cyprian (who lived in the middle of the third century) and all downward.

Some did of late, with great assurance of their skill in computing the history of the prophecies, fix the beginning of the apostatical times about the middle of the fifth century, viz., at the year four hundred fifty-five, or six\*. But most readers of Scripture did then think even that date to be by many years too soon, (for the Scripture does not for every decay of the church impute *apostasy*, or

\* [Probably the person principally alluded to is Mr. Whiston; who maintained this position strongly, in his 'Essay on the Revelation of St. John,' 4to, Cambridge, 1706. See Mr. Whiston's interpretation and arguments examined by Dr. Wells, both in his 'Explanation of the Revelation,' (4to. Oxford, 1717;) more especially at page 102: and like-

wise in his 'Explanation of the book of Daniel,' (4to. Oxford, 1716.) especially at page 80.—According to Whiston's theory, a great advancement and improvement in the state of the church and of religion was expected to take place in the year 1716, a point here touched by Dr. Wall.]

*falling away*, to it; but then when the corruption becomes a gangrene. And the Roman empire held a considerable degree of power, even in Italy, to a much later date.) And now they themselves may see their own mistake. For it was by their hypothesis to last but 1260 years, (which with the 456 make 1716,) and then a great advancement, or resurrection, of true religion and of Christ's kingdom was to begin. Which he that thinks to be now, or does not see that Christendom is yet in the dregs of that degeneracy, does not know what religion, or Christ's kingdom, is. But none, as I said, did ever conceive it to have begun during the fourth century.

I mention these things to you for this reason; that you (who perhaps may not be acquainted with the character of the Christians that lived in the several ages or centuries of the church, by reading the books and histories of each century) may be able, by such general accounts as lie open to all readers of Scripture, to understand that the centuries which we quote, and which Mr. Gale yields, were not within the space of that *falling away*, but were times wherein the true spirit and genius of Christian religion and piety did continue to a degree, to which we may wish we could see any thing equal in our time. And that consequently you may perceive, that not only those that have told you, that infant-baptism began but of late under such or such a pope of Rome; but also Mr. Gale, who insinuates to you that it began in 'the corrupt centuries,' do abuse you.

You perceive and mind, that I speak now only of the time that he yields, from St. Cyprian and downward. Not but that there is evidence, both from Scripture and from the elder Fathers, (such as may satisfy any impartial inquirer,) of its being from the beginning.

Suffer me to advise you of one thing, wherein the writers against infant-baptism take advantage of your incapacity to read the ancient Christian authors yourselves. There are some of the Fathers, who in their books that are left have not happened to say any thing about the baptizing of infants; there having not been any dispute about that in their time; and yet they have perhaps occasion, by reason of the frequent baptisms of adult converts then, to speak of the sacrament of baptism in general. And when they do so speak of it in general, it is common with them to mention faith, and a serious purpose of amendment of life, &c., as necessary for those who are by that sacrament entered into the Christian covenant.

Now it is usual with the antipædobaptist writers to collect a number of these sayings, concerning the necessity of faith, &c., as there are thousands of them. Those of the said writers who are cautious not to discover the weakness of their plea, pick them out of such Fathers, in whose books there is not any mention of the case of infants; and they would have an unlearned man conclude from them that those Fathers must have thought baptism of infants impracticable, because they do in those general sentences speak of faith and repentance as requisite to baptism.

Now all such arguings are shewed to be inconclusive by this one observation, viz., that those Fathers who were uncontestedly pædobaptists, and in whose time the practice is notoriously known, do, when they speak of baptism in general, speak in the same language, and insist upon the same qualifications.

A learned friend has sent me a collection of several such sayings of such Fathers as the antipædobaptists themselves do own to have practised infant-baptism; and advised me to let you see some of them.

St. Cyprian, who lived in the hundred and fiftieth year after the apostles, is now well known to the antipædobaptists, as one maintaining the doctrine of pædobaptism; and yet he, when he is discoursing of baptism in general, has sentences concerning the necessity of faith, repentance, &c., to baptism, as positive as can be found in any Father whatsoever.

As for example. *Epist. 75. ed. Oxon.*<sup>t</sup>

‘ Qui cum Noe in arca non fuerunt, non tantum purgati [et  
‘ salvati] per aquam non sunt, sed statim diluvio illo perierunt.  
‘ Sic et nunc quicumque in ecclesia cum Christo non sunt, foris  
‘ peribunt; nisi ad unicum et salutare ecclesiæ lavacrum per pœni-  
‘ tentiam convertantur.

‘ They who were not with Noah in the ark, obtained no purgation  
‘ or cleansing by the water, but even perished by that flood. So also  
‘ *whoever* they are that are not with Christ in the church, will perish  
‘ as men out of it; unless they do come, *with repentance*, to that only  
‘ salutary sacrament [washing] of the church.”

Here one of the writers I mentioned would, from the universality of this sentence, ‘ whoever they are,’ have concluded that no person whatsoever was in Cyprian’s judgment capable of that sacrament of baptism without *repentance*; if we had not otherwise known his sentiment concerning infants being baptized, from those places of his books where he treats particularly of their case.

<sup>t</sup> [P. 225. and p. 148. of the Benedictine edition, with the addition of the words *et salvati.*]



The like use they would make of his seventieth Epistle, where he is speaking of the interrogations made at baptism; ‘Dost thou ‘believe,’ &c., if he had happened never to write any thing concerning the baptism of infants.

Gregory Nyssen lived in those times and places, when and where the antipædobaptists themselves now do not deny that infant-baptism was in use, viz. more than a hundred years after St. Cyprian. He mentions faith and prayer among the things that complete the sacrament of baptism. *Orat. Catechet. cap. 33<sup>u</sup>.*

Εὐχὴ πρὸς Θεόν, καὶ χάριτος οὐρανίας ἐπίκλησις, καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ πίστις ἐστὶ, δι’ ὧν τὸ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως πληροῦται μυστήριον. ‘Prayer to ‘God, and the imploring of the heavenly grace, and the water, and ‘*faith*, are the things that make up the sacrament of regeneration.’

St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin himself, when they speak of baptism in general, use sayings like to these. Yet we are sure from other places in their books, that they understood the case of infants to be a particular and excepted case; and that they were to be baptized though they had not at present those qualifications; but that they were by baptism dedicated to that religion which would teach them, and which did require of them, these conditions as they grew up.

And I gave in my book, part ii. chap. i. § 2, a pattern of two sayings; one of St. Basil, and one of St. Hierome. Which, if we were not sure of the contrary, might make one think that they were antipædobaptists, viz., a place where St. Basil says, ‘one must ‘believe first; and then be sealed with baptism.’ St. Hierome says of the apostles, that they first taught the nations, and then baptized them. ‘For it cannot be, that the body do receive the sacrament ‘of baptism, unless the soul have before received the true faith.’ And the Catechism of the Church of England speaks at the same rate; ‘There is required of persons to be baptized *faith* and ‘*repentance*.’ Yet it is known that all these knew, and allowed of, the baptizing of infants.

And therefore, when we meet with such sayings in the book of some other Father, who perhaps has not occasion in any part of his book to speak of the case of infants; yet we have no sufficient reason from such sayings of his to conclude his meaning to be that they should not be baptized; any more than it can be concluded from the like sayings of St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, &c.

Mr. Danvers, and some other antipædobaptists, that have made it their business to collect great numbers of quotations from the

<sup>u</sup> [See Gregorii Nysseni Opera, Gr. Lat. 3 tom. fol. *Paris*. 1638. tom. iii. p. 95.]

Fathers, have, if they aimed at convincing men from thence that those Fathers were against the baptizing of infants, done very imprudently to set down, among the rest, such sayings of St. Austin, and others who are known paedobaptists: because these betrayed the mistake of the sense which they would have put on all the rest.

This answer may satisfy the doubts of some who have been staggered by such quotations; and might have satisfied Mr. Gale of the invalidity of that argument which he brought from such a saying of Dionysius of Alexandria, which I a little above rehearsed.

As to the other dispute, concerning the *manner* of administering baptism, into which he has dragged me by putting my name into that part of his book; I need not do as he does; recapitulate what I have said: for he himself has given up your plea; so far as it makes immersion *absolutely* necessary. *Dipping*, he says, it must be. The word *baptize* necessarily signifies that. But he cannot maintain that sense of the word to be constant, not even in his own instances, but by yielding that if *any part* of the thing be covered with water, (it is no matter whether put into the water, or the water put over that,) the thing is *dipped*. And he instances; by dipping the nib of a pen in ink, the pen is dipped. Which will justify, not only the sprinklers, but him that should baptize by putting the tip of the person's finger in water. A thing reproachful to baptism, both in your sense and ours. And which if I had said, I should be ashamed ever to shew my face in any dispute about baptism.

If I do address to my brethren of the clergy, I ought to do it as to them from whom it is fitter for me to receive advice, than give any to them. But as it has happened to be my lot to spend a good deal of that time which they do much better employ, in thinking, talking, reading and writing about this matter; I would humbly hope that a few words of the result of my thoughts, concerning the question, and the schism raised upon it, and the way to heal it, or prevent its spreading, may be not unkindly taken.

I am clearly of opinion, that it was not any scruple or offence taken at the baptizing persons in infancy, that raised this schism. As that has been from the beginning in our church, and in all churches; the unity and satisfaction of all people in it, from the beginning till of late, is a proof that it must be some new thing at which the offence was taken. There has no novelty or alteration, that I know of, in the point of baptism, been brought into our church, but in the *way or manner* of administering it. The way that is now ordinarily used we cannot deny to have been a novelty,

brought into this church by those that had learned it in Germany or at Geneva. And they were not contented to follow the example of *pouring* a quantity of water, (which had there been introduced instead of *immersion*;) but improved it (if I may so abuse that word) from *pouring* to *sprinkling*; that it might have as little resemblance of the ancient way of baptizing as possible.

It is that, I verily believe, that has given the occasion. And by all the search that I have been able, in discourse with the vulgar people, to make into the grounds of the dissatisfaction which they have conceived concerning their baptism received in the church in their infancy, the main hinge has turned, not upon the *time*, but the *manner* of its administration. Mr. Gale (as well as the rest of their writers) seems to have been sensible of this. And therefore, though he entitled his book 'Reflections' upon mine, which had not meddled (or but in a few lines) with the *manner* of baptism; he sought his advantage by drawing in, by head and shoulders, a dispute about that; wherein he knew that the examples of Scripture and other antiquity, and the full persuasion of that people, and of all the Eastern church to this day, is on his side: and I had the disadvantage to plead for a way of baptism, of which the best I could say was, that it is sufficient for the essence of baptism; but could not deny the other (except in the case of danger of health) to be the fittest.

The solemnity of the circumstances in the administration of baptism (as also of the other sacrament) does very powerfully strike and affect the mind of any devout Christian that sees it administered. The baptism of an infant cannot have all the solemnity which that of an adult person may have. The previous fasting and prayer, the penitent confessions, the zeal and humility and deep affection of the receiver may be visible there; which cannot be in the case of an infant. But for that very reason we ought not to deprive the administration of this sacrament to infants of any solemnity of which it is capable.

The *immersion* of the person (whether infant or adult) in the posture of one that is buried and raised up again, is much more solemn, and expresses the design of the sacrament, and the mystery of the spiritual washing much better, than pouring a small quantity of water on the face. And that *pouring* of water is much better than *sprinkling*, or dropping a drop of water on it. If it be done in the church, in or at the font, and the congregation do join in the prayers there used, it is much more solemn than in a bedchamber, out of a basin or pipkin, a teacup or a punchbowl; and a bed-

chamber is perhaps not quite so scandalous as a kitchen or stable ; to which things look as if they would bring it at last.

These innovations and alterations for the worse, these *vilipendiums* of the holy sacrament shewn and used in the baptizing of infants, I take to have been the occasions of the disgust and dissatisfaction conceived by the people concerning the baptism they had received in infancy ; and to have given rise to the schism of the antipædobaptists, (which never spread much in England till these abuses were notorious,) and to be to this day causes of the growth of it. And consequently, that the reforming of them would be by God's grace a good and likely means for the healing of it. And we have reason to give God thanks, that the present orders and rubrics of our church are all calculated for the reforming of these abuses, and preserving the dignity of this holy sacrament ; and that there wants nothing but the due execution of them, and our conscientious performing of that which we all solemnly promised before God and the bishop, when we had the charge of souls committed to us, that ' we would conform to the Liturgy of the church of England, as it ' is now by law established.'

That excellent Liturgy orders the priest, (and accordingly he is bound in conscience,) that (if the godfathers and godmothers shall certify him that the child may well endure it) he do *dip* it in the water discreetly and warily, &c. I know that they are generally of late very backward in certifying this, or consenting to it. But that is nothing but an ill custom. Many of them are satisfied that the dipping or bathing a child in water has no such danger to the health, as has been pretended. But they are unwilling to do otherwise than has of late been done. A few examples of the old Scripture way would cure this prejudice. And the curates of parishes, as on one side they are no fit judges of the strength or weakness of the child, and so must not do this against the parents' or godfathers' will ; so on the other side might, if they would, much influence the godly people to consent to it. I do not say that any one curate (if all round about him do shew a contrary temper and inclination) can do much in it ; but the joint endeavours of any competent number in a neighbourhood, having both such plain truth, and the Liturgy, and all ancient practice on their side, would easily convince the people, that that which all our fathers in this island practised, till few years ago, without any damage to their children's health, cannot be impracticable now.

I propose this, not for the case of such children as are weaker than ordinary, but only in the case of such as have as good a degree



of strength to bear it, as children ordinarily have. And having spoken my sense of this matter to my brethren more largely above at the end of my answer to Mr. Gale's fifth chapter, shall not trouble them with repetition.

To those who use *sprinkling* instead of *dipping*, or even of *pouring* water, (which last is enjoined by our church even in the weakest child's case,) I would humbly represent the consideration of the duty of obedience which they owe, not only to the rules of the church, to which they have promised to conform; but also and chiefly to our Saviour himself, whose word of command is *baptize*. I wish they would study the notion and emphasis of that word. We are forced to some pains in defence of our practice against those who pretend that it does necessarily and absolutely include *dipping* in its signification. I think we must not, and cannot, deny that it includes *washing* in its signification. They will do well to consider, whether they shall be able to justify before our Saviour, that a *drop*, or a *sprinkle* or two, of water can be so fairly understood to be a *washing* of the person in his sense, as pouring water is. I know that it may be justified in Mr. Gale's sense of the word *baptize*. As a pen, he says, is *dipped*, if the nib of it be dipped. I hope none of the church will think fit to use such quibbles in a serious and sacred thing. Suppose that such a washing by *sprinkling*, or a *drop*, be sufficient in case of some necessity that may happen, (as I hope it is,) shall we thereupon in ordinary cases go as near to the breaking of Christ's command as possibly we can? *Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?*

I know that some midwives and nurses do on the christening day (which they think is observed, not so much for the sacrament itself, as for their shewing their pride, art, and finery) dress the child's head so, that the face of it being hid deep under the lace and trimming which stands up high on each side, the minister cannot come at the face to *pour* water on it, so as that it may run off again; but what water he pours, will run in among the headcloths (which really is likely to do the child more hurt than *dipping* would have done). But he must make them remedy this inconvenience: and give them to understand, that if they will have their children baptized, they must bring them in such a dress as to be capable of it.

Concerning the other abuse of this sacrament, the administering it in private houses, bedchambers, &c., to children that are well, I spoke my sense in my book in the notes I made on St. Austin's account of the devout people running to church with their sick

children that were in danger of death, to have them speedily baptized\*. I have this more to lay to the consciences of those my brethren of the clergy that use themselves to give these bedchamber baptisms; that they would consider, both the profanation and indignity they bring on Christ's sacrament, and also how directly contrary their practice is to the Liturgy which they are obliged in duty and by solemn promise to conform to. The Liturgy appoints two several offices for baptism of infants in two several cases. One more solemn for *public* baptism, to be used nowhere but in the church; to which all children that are in an ordinary state of health are to be brought. The other to be used *in houses* in cases of necessity, and not else. And these are very different (not different baptisms, but have different circumstances) one from the other. Now for any clergyman that is under the obligation of conscience I spoke of, to take one of these, (that of *public* baptism,) and use it *in houses*, is plainly contrary to the said obligation. And some of the prayers so misapplied become absurd and ridiculous. For example; the minister standing at the font in the church is to say that prayer; 'Grant that whosoever is *here* dedicated to thee by 'our office and ministry,' &c. Can he think that that '*here*' is applicable to this parlour or bedchamber? is it not scandalous so to apply it? or has he any authority to omit or alter the form?

The profanation and indignity in general on this sacrament on occasion of this house-baptism, is so notorious, that I do appeal to the experience and conscience of all that use it, if they themselves be not scandalized at the indecent circumstances that do almost always attend it. All the regard is commonly given to the preparations for eating and drinking; very little to the sacrament. Very few of the company join in the prayers; but only in the feasting and carnal jollity, which is too often carried on to such excess, as is more likely to bring a curse than a blessing upon the whole undertaking. This is commonly yet worse, when it is in an alehouse or other lewd house. Those who in such cases are chosen for godfathers and godmothers are generally persons ignorant of the terms of the baptismal covenant themselves; and when they should make answer in the name of the child to the holy interrogatories, they neither mind the substance of the thing asked, nor do know what answer is fit to make; but do only in a ridiculous manner give a bow, a curtesy, or a nod; and that often not without apparent signs of mockery: and they frequently shew a very vain, irreverent, and wanton behaviour before, and in, and after the sacred administra-

\* [See vol. i. p. 188, &c.]

tion. Is not this enough to turn the stomach of any serious Christian that is present? And if they reflect with themselves, and think, ‘Is this the way that I was baptized in?’ to occasion perhaps their falling into the error we are speaking of, and resolving to be baptized again? Can a minister of Christ take any comfort, or can he think that the dignity of the holy office which he is performing is preserved, in such a management?

In all parishes where baptism at the church is generally left off, the people are so ignorant of what is to be done and said at baptism (many of the young people having hardly ever been present at one), that if a child be brought to church to be baptized, neither are the congregation sensible of their duty of joining in the prayers, nor do the godfathers know what answer they are to make; but there are holy questions publicly put without any one to answer: which, however it passes in a bedchamber, is a great scandal and absurdity when a sacrament is administering in a Christian congregation. And when the young people of such a parish come to the curate, to be prepared for confirmation, they are found to have but a slender apprehension of what was stipulated in their name at baptism (which is the chief thing that should make them capable of confirmation); because, though they have learned the words in the Catechism, yet having never seen the thing transacted, they have not near so lively an idea of the holy covenant. But where baptisms are duly administered in the church in the time of divine service, all the congregation do both learn to understand the office of a godfather; and it is usually performed with such decent seriousness as the nature of the thing requires; and the whole congregation (as St. Austin expresses it) ‘of the saints (or good Christians) does this office of offering the infant to God for the ‘receiving of the spiritual grace.’ And there is also that more momentous advantage, (with which, as with one of the reasons why baptism should always, if possible, be administered in the sight of the people, our church does enforce the command,) that ‘every man present is put in remembrance of his own profession made to God ‘in his baptism.’

No serious Christian, that has considered these advantages, would have his child miss of them; nor would have him baptized in that disadvantageous way, if the minister would. If any man desire baptism for his child that is well, and yet has so little value for it, that he thinks it too much, and refuses to bring him to the right and proper place of receiving it; what I might do for the sake of the child, (who, as Nazianzen says, is not in the fault,) is a question

by itself; but if the man himself had not yet been baptized, and did ask it with such an irreligious coldness, and insisting on such haughty terms, I am sure I would not give it him, (of what degree soever he were, from an emperor to a beggar,) but let him keep his pride with his heathenism, for it agrees very ill with Christianity.

In the primitive times, if any heathen man, high or low, noble or ignoble, would turn Christian, and be baptized, the Christians did not admit it to be done privately. He must some time before the baptism come into a full congregation of Christians, and there standing up in a place in the church provided for that purpose, openly repeat the Christian creed, and declare his owning of it. Some, that had been in repute, and in great stations among the heathens, were ashamed to do this; but the Christians would not believe him to be sincere till he did it. Our Christian ancestors in England, though they had, in large parishes, chapels and oratories, for the ease of such as lived remote from the mother church, for hearing God's word, and praying, &c., yet none of them would lose the privilege of receiving the communion, and of having this other sacrament of baptism conferred on their children, in the mother church; to which they would bring their children, though it were a long journey, to be baptized by *dipping* in the font. And do we, their degenerate offspring, turn not only the font into a bason, but also this mother-church into a bedchamber?

I know that if any curate of a parish do insist upon having all children of rich and poor, that are in health, brought to church, and do refuse to shew the respect (so those ignorant half Christians call it) of bringing the sacrament to their houses, and do plead the rubric and order of the church in his own vindication; he shall in some parishes of haughty, rude, and ill-bred people, meet with a great deal of obloquy; and among other things they will object to him, not only the example of such or such a neighbour curate, who complies in this matter; but also that such or such a one of those that are in the highest station in the church does many times shew that condescension which he refuses to do. And we must blush, that such things can be said, and we cannot deny them. But every one in the holy orders ought to reckon his commission to be received from Christ; and under Christ, from that church in which, and by whose rules and canons he is called and sent; and not to follow the example of any particular man or men, in how great station soever, in things wherein they deviate from that which should be their rule as well as ours.

What must be done, or can be done, in places where presby-



terians lie in wait to draw people from the church into separations, and do offer their service to any humoursome man or woman, that if the parish curate will not baptize their child at home, they will; is more than I am able to determine. It must be left to the bishop of the place, to direct which of the two evils must be chosen. I have been credibly informed that the late pious bishop of London<sup>y</sup> found it necessary to advise his clergy in the city to comply in this matter with their people, rather than let them fall into the hands of those seducers: but that in his visitation in the country places, he advised them to keep steady to the rubric. Certainly those leaders of the separation will have a good load of guilt; who neither will reform abuses among their own followers, nor suffer us to do it among our people. These are the men, who, when the church made an order for private baptism of children in danger of speedy death, did so clamour against it<sup>z</sup>, that one of them said, it was *unlawful*, even though the child was to be damned for want of baptism. I know that many of the parochial clergy do wish and desire that the bishops would in open court, and in the audience of the people, lay a strict charge upon them, not to baptize any child that is well in a house. Because otherwise the people are apt to tell the curate, that he might do this, if he would; and endeavour to bring the more envy upon him for refusing.

There is one thing that I am loath to speak of; that some of the clergy are thought by some people to use this compliance for their own sordid gain; and for the sake of the *present*, which is given to the baptizer for submitting the sacrament, and his own holy office, to the humour of some irreligious parents. St. Paul speaks of some who did keep alehouse with God's word; that is his phrase, 2 Cor. ii. 17, *καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *sell it, prostitute it*, in the same sense as authors use the word *καπηλεύειν τὴν δίκην*, or *τὴν εἰρήνην*, *to sell justice*, or *sell a peace*, as a *κάπηλος*, an alehouse keeper sells his ale. God Almighty keep us from doing this with his sacrament. It is more than enough, it is to a dreadful degree too much, that benefices, places, offices, promotions in the church are trucked. If we can keep any thing unprostituted, it should be God's word, and his sacraments. St. James shews the mischief of having any respect of persons, rich and poor, in concerns of religion. It will certainly have the same effect there, which Solomon says it has

<sup>y</sup> [Bishop Henry Compton. See the point briefly touched in his '*Episcopalia*, ' or letters to the clergy of his Diocese,' 18mo. London, 1686, p. 3 to 7.]

<sup>z</sup> [This took place at the Savoy Con-

ference, just before the revival of the Liturgy in the reign of Charles II. See an account of all the objections urged against various parts of it, by Richard Baxter and others.]

every where, where it is admitted. *To have respect of persons is not good* (he means it is a very mischievous thing). *For a piece of bread that man will transgress.* These clergymen (if there be any such, for I own I know of none, only there runs in some people's discourses such a censure) do every Lord's day say that prayer; 'That God would give grace to all bishops and curates—rightly and duly to administer his holy sacraments.' They pray this for themselves among the rest. They should not by undue administrations defeat their own prayers.

I could wish also, that the usual feasts at christenings, and the customary presents then given by the godfathers, &c., were left off; and that the clergy would persuade their parishioners to leave them off. They may very well be called *nehushtan*<sup>a</sup>. How innocently or commendably soever, for a sign of spiritual congratulation, they were first used; as they are used now, they bring more disgrace than credit to the sacrament. Beside the sinful excesses too common, they do, like the popish ceremonies, swallow up all the regard that should be given to the substance of the sacrament itself. They are also the cause of the difficulty of procuring godfathers to poor people's children.

The sum of what I would propose to the consideration of my brethren and of all pious members of our church on this head, is; that whatsoever brings a discredit, a contempt, an indignity, or profanation on the sacrament, as it is administered to infants, does help to increase the doubts of those who are inclined to be dissatisfied with their baptism received *in infancy*; and so is an occasion of promoting the schism; and should be reformed on our side.

Another thing that I think useful for any of the clergy whose ill fortune it is to be under a necessity of being concerned with any of their people in this question, is; that they make a difference between three sorts of antipædobaptists; for there is a different sort of management fit to be used toward them.

Some few of them do still continue to hold communion with the established church in the public prayers, and in the other sacrament; and in this too, as far as is consistent with their opinion, i. e. when their children are *adult*, and desire baptism, they advise them to receive it in the church, at the hands of the lawful minister. They are sensible, that whatever becomes of the question of pædobaptism, schism is certainly a great sin. I did, in my book<sup>b</sup>, give my thoughts,

<sup>a</sup> ['A mere piece of brass.' The name by which in contempt Hezekiah designated the brasen serpent set up by Moses, which the Israelites in process of time

had converted into an object of idolatrous worship. 2 Kings xviii. 4.]

<sup>b</sup> [Vol. i. chap. xi.]

(but professing to submit them to the judgment of those who are over us in the Lord,) that such men, though in a mistake in that one opinion, should be received as brethren; and that, as they do not excommunicate us, so we should not them. And that in this case, where there is no difference in the fundamentals of the faith, nor any self-willed spirit of opposition, that rule of St. Paul does hold, Phil. iii. 15, *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, (i. e. of different opinions,) God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless whereto we have already attained, (or in things wherein we agree,) let us walk by the same rule: let us be unanimous.* These men give a good proof that they have not that self-willed spirit of opposition that I spoke of, by this; that they do not run into the separation. For that is a thing which all proud self-conceited persons love above all things. And it is for the sake of that, (that they may have the honour and pride of setting up, or keeping up, a party by themselves, that most of them do value the opinions for which they stickle. St. Paul says, *There must be sects (or heresies) in a church; that they which are approved may be made manifest,* or distinguished from the rest. He means, I think, that the sects will take off all the proud, self-conceited, schismatically disposed people. And that he that is not drawn away with this temptation, does so far *approve* himself a solid, humble, and good Christian. And we may add this particular, that he that withstands that temptation in England may be ventured any where. For there is no place in the world, where Christ is named, (or if I except one, that shall be all,) in which the sinfulness of schism is so little considered; or the encouragements and temptation to it so great. These men therefore, even where they err, are to be thought to act in the sincerity of their heart. And there is a very different deportment due toward such, from that which is to be used to wilful opposers. The determining of the question, whether they shall be continued in communion, will belong chiefly to the bishop of the place, (if ever it please God that the discipline and authority of the church be restored,) and not to those of my brethren to whom I pretend to offer this my advice. But the bishop himself will regard the character of the men which the parochial clergy shall give.

I do not mean that they ought to be flattered by any one that has the cure of their souls, as one of late with his new divinity flatters them and all erroneous Christians<sup>c</sup>; that whatever their errors

<sup>c</sup> [The allusion is to *Hoadly*, bishop of Bangor: whose doctrine on the point may be seen in his 'Preservative against

' the principles and practices of the Non-jurors in Church and State.' 8<sup>o</sup>. p. 54, 55 of the edition, *Dublin* 1716. The bishop

in religion be, yet if they be sincere in the choice of their tenets, and judge as well as they can, and practise accordingly ; they are then (though in an error) in as good case as those that hold the very truth according to the real meaning of Christ in the Scripture, and practise accordingly. Or, as he expresses it, and calls it a *demonstration*, that wherever the sincerity is equal, it must have equal effect in justifying the person.

Such an untheological opinion (that ignorance or error excuses not only *a tanto* but *a toto*) will make St. Paul (who *always lived in all good conscience*, and in those *many things which he did contrary to the name of Jesus*, was sincere, and did what he *verily thought with himself he ought to do*) to have been as unblameable and as much justified in that opposition to Christianity, as he was in holding the truth afterward. This makes a *Socinian*, a *Quaker*, a *Papist*, and for ought I can see, a *Turk*, if they be sincere, to be in as good case as the most orthodox Christian.

The antipædobaptist himself, of whom I am speaking, will not, if he be a man of tolerable sense and understanding, accept of comfort to his conscience on such a ground as this, which will justify the Quaker in the denial of all baptism, as soon as him in the denial of it to his children under age ; and the other antipædobaptists who make a *schism* for their opinion, as soon as him who owns and desires to keep *the communion of saints*.

All that I would say to represent such a man as fit to be admitted to communion is, *first*, that his error about the time or age of giving baptism is not a fundamental one ; and, *secondly*, that he does not make a schism for it ; and, *thirdly*, that he is much more likely to have his erroneous opinion rectified by his continuing in the unity of the church ; and we have much more encouragement to take pains with him, while he does so.

The *first English* antipædobaptists, that made any considerable number, were of this sort. They held communion with the *presbyterians*, (for it was in their reign that they sprang up,) and the *presbyterians* did not reject them from communion ; though they wrote and disputed eagerly against their tenet. And I believe that a total breach of communion had never been made, had it not been for a wicked contrivance and mischievous circumstance of those times, which I wish had been peculiar to them.

There was then a sort of atheistical state-politicians, and military officers, (that aimed at the ruin of church and state, and effected it,)

did not escape censure for his remarks.  
See Law's 'Letter to him on his Sermon,

'and on some dangerous doctrines in his  
'*Preservative*,' 8°. 1718. p. 4—10.



who were not willing that the doctrine, or discipline, or authority of any church at all, should bear any great sway ; for none could be for their turn. And therefore, as they had encouraged the *presbyterians* (who formerly under the name of *puritans* had lived in communion with the church of England) to separate from it, and fight against it ; and had sufficiently weakened all the authority of that : so now, not meaning that the *presbyterian* discipline should have power enough, or regard enough among the people, to check or thwart their impious designs any more than the other had been able to do, they set up and encouraged all the dissenting parties of men they could, against that establishment too, and amongst the rest, the antipædobaptists.

The *dissenting* of these men was not enough for their turn. They must *separate*<sup>d</sup>, and set up one church against another, if they would have any *place* of advantage in the state, or the army. If they would do that, they were capable of being captains, colonels, major-generals, &c. Too many of the antipædobaptists went into the separation. The honestest, and most sincere and judicious of them (and particularly Mr. Tombes) protested and remonstrated against their doing so ; and continued in communion with the established church. The few that, as I said, do now continue with us are of that stamp.

The contrivance and aim that I spoke of, to weaken and frustrate any church authority, was carried on in those times upon a very different principle from that which has been made use of for the same purpose since. As for the authority of the church to censure, judge, and, if need be, excommunicate men for heretical and blasphemous tenets published, as well as for immoral actions committed, I do not remember that any sect then denied it ; but each sect assumed it to themselves : the *presbyterians* and *antipædobaptists* as high as any. This served the purpose of the men I spoke of, as well then, as the new hypothesis does now. For if forty churches in a nation do oppose and slight each other's censures and authority ; a libertine, a deist, and enricher of himself by the spoils of the public, a Socinian, &c. is as safe, as if no church at all had that power. And the old way was the more artificial, and did not nigh so plainly contradict the Scripture, as they do, who deny that Christ ever gave such power at all ; when it is notorious, and seen in Scripture by all the sectaries themselves, that he did.

The abounding of sects was a thing very much for their turn then.

<sup>d</sup> [See Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. i. p. 147, &c., and Ivimey, vol. i. p. 137, &c.]

But they had not then, as I remember, any advocate<sup>e</sup>, who recommended this as a desirable thing, and that they were all of them well-pleasing to God. But every party owned (what is indeed plain in Scripture) that there ought to be no divisions; and so counted all the rest blameable, except their own.

Such of us clergymen as are old enough to have any memory of those confusions<sup>f</sup>, have been apt to comfort ourselves with hopes that we should not leave the church of England in worse case than we found it, and yet it recovered out of that. But really they startle us, when they talk of making the church of Christ only a *number*, without any cohesion, government, or discipline; for that is a higher degree of debasing it, and tends more directly to the dissolving of it, than any of the pretences of those men; who always confessed it to be a *body*, or *society*, or, as the article expresses it, a *congregation*, which required union in the parts, and a subordination of some members to others. The mischief *then* was, that each of their several composites pretended to be that *body*, with an exclusion of almost all others.

This sort of antipædobaptists, which I am now speaking of, were commendable then, for that, however they dissented in this particular tenet, they would not be carried by any of those ignorant, rash, and selfish leaders into that dreadful extremity of separation, which is of far greater guilt than the error itself. And since they could see through all the hypocritical pretences of the seducers of those times, they may, I hope, be trusted with scanning the present scheme made for division; which has a cover of godliness a great deal thinner and more transparent than those had; and indeed seems calculated not for catching scrupulous or tender consciences, but for encouraging sceptics, deists, &c., or those that aim to get money by their separating.

To antipædobaptists of this temper, the curate of a parish should, I think, carry himself as to candid dissenters. And as they still own themselves of his flock, and preserve in most parts of religion a Christian brotherhood with the rest of his parishioners, and do continue to give him any opportunity of applying what proofs, reasons, and arguments he is able for their satisfaction; he ought to do it in the most mild and friendly way. And if at last he fail of success, yet to hope that our blessed Saviour, who has severely threatened those that break the unity of his body, will more easily pardon a sincere, though erroneous member in it.

*Secondly*, of those antipædobaptists that do *separate*, all are not of one sort. For some, and those far the greatest number, have, even

<sup>e</sup> [See above, p. 649.]

<sup>f</sup> [Dr. Wall was born in the year 1645.]

in their separation, so much of Christianity, modesty, and charity left; as to take and own the church of England, and other protestant pædobaptist churches, to be Christians, and not to want any *essential or fundamental* requisites of a *Christian Church*.

I quoted some of the most noted antipædobaptists that have been in England; Mr. Tombes<sup>g</sup>, declaring an abhorrence of those that carried the dispute to unchristian extremities; Mr. Stennet<sup>h</sup>, calling it a reproach cast on the antipædobaptists; ‘That they judge none ‘ of the true church but those of their own way.’ And, more than that, the public *confessions*<sup>i</sup> and *declarations* of the hundred churches, as they style themselves, professing ‘their *consent* with other protestants in all the *fundamental* articles of Christian religion.’ And, ‘that all persons throughout the world, professing the faith, &c., not ‘ destroying their own profession by any errors *erecting the foundation*, &c., are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God.’ These are, for general principles, sounder than some lately vented by one or two that profess themselves of our church.

It is true, they do for all this continue in actual separation. I do not mean Mr. Tombes did; but most of these present subscribers of the *confession* which I mentioned do. What reason they have to give, or how, after such declarations, they do endeavour to justify their separation, I know not. If I had had the good fortune to have had my book answered by one of those, instead of Mr. Gale, I must have known their ground. He would not say a word concerning that *confession*, or concerning the declarations of Mr. Tombes or Mr. Stennet.

I did once propose the question to Mr. Stennet; how they did count it consistent with such declarations to renounce communion? He answered; that they should not refuse to admit a pædobaptist, against whom they had no other objection, to their communion. I remember, he was pleased to instance in me: so that he must mean, one that had no other baptism, but in infancy, and by pouring water. There was not then time (for we were just parting) for the question that ought to have followed next; why, if they could admit us, if we came to their assemblies, they might not with as good conscience come and communicate (in the prayers and the other sacrament) at ours? And I never after had opportunity before his death to renew the conversation.

It must be, either that they hold something in which they must

<sup>g</sup> [See vol. i. p. 679, and 683.]

<sup>h</sup> [Vol. i. p. 675.]

<sup>i</sup> [Vol. i. p. 555, 675, 676, 686.]

join, in our prayers, or way of worship or of communicating, to be sinful: or, that it is sinful in them to be present at the baptizing of an infant, though they do not join in those particular prayers: or else, that those who have different opinions in things *not fundamental* must set up several communions, or churches. Which last is a very mistaken notion; has done unspeakable mischief in hindering many sorts of protestants, *Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians*, &c., from communicating with the national churches where providence has placed them: and will, if it be followed, propagate divisions *in infinitum*: and yet, to our shame, is encouraged in some even of our own pulpits.

This sort of antipædobaptists, though they separate themselves from us, yet do it not upon so uncharitable a principle, nor do shew so obstinate a temper, but that there may be some hopes of reducing them to a right sentiment, either of the essentials of the sacrament of baptism; or at least, of the article of the *communion of saints*: and hopes, that pains spent with them in conversing, discoursing, arguing and recommending books to them, may be not in vain. Which pains should be taken, and used with them, in all patience and meekness, so long till they appear incorrigible in their schism.

*Thirdly*, there is another sort, who do not only separate from, but rail at our church, clergy, and people, and all other protestants, as being either *no Christians*, (as many of them do shew their real sentiment to be) or *no church*; having no bishops, no Christian presbyters, no sacraments, &c. As you see Mr. Gale and that sort do broadly intimate their censure.

There are, God be thanked, but few of them so far gone in the spirit of uncharitableness. They that are deserve to be thought as far from Christianity as they censure all others to be. He that excommunicates all Christendom, except himself and so very few, does stand *ipso facto* excommunicated from them whom he so renounces. As Firmilianus told Stephen bishop of Rome, that by excommunicating so many as he did, all that he got was, that he had cut himself off from so many churches of Christ. Whatever becomes of the questions of baptism, he that has lost charity has lost his Christianity.

I do not say, but that some pains of admonishing should be used even with these. But I think such a temper of obstinacy, arrogance, and censorious self-conceit to be that very disposition which St. Paul meant by the name of *heresy*, when he ordered Titus, that such men he should after the first and second admonition reject.



Ἀρεσις does grammatically signify that temper; and I believe St. Paul took it in that sense at that place.

I have known some of the other sorts recovered. None ever of this. None, I mean, of such as were quite gone off from us, and herded with them, and had imbibed that censorious spirit with which they infect one another. Many that were wavering, and half way seduced, have been reclaimed.

Any of my brethren that shall have occasion, or think it necessary to *write* any thing in this controversy, may comfort themselves, that they cannot have worse luck than I have had. I set myself to speak of the antipædobaptists in the civilest language I could. The answerer represents me as a spiteful slanderer of them: picks up personal stories of my actions nothing to the purpose: pretends to publish a character of me: runs from one end of my book to the other, to single out passages upon which he thinks he can declaim: faces down the world, that I have said things there, which I never said; as, that there is no proof of infant-baptism from Scripture: gives very insulting and reproachful language, &c. I fancy they will not employ him again; but do rather hope they will call him to account for using, in the defence of their cause, affirmations of matters of fact which are not true.

My opinion was, that there needed no answer to his book. Some very worthy men thought that for the sake of the people it might be needful. I told them, they must then think of some younger man, fitter to bear the fatigue of writing books: and I thought for a long time that that course had been taken; and depended upon it. It came however to be devolved on me, and the English proverb made good, *Wear out the old one first*. The reader, that sees the imperfection of the performance, must consider the defects of age.

I thank God who has enabled me to come to the end of it a little (God knows how little) before the end of my life<sup>k</sup>. For I have been apprehensive of dying in a circumstance, in which archbishop Tillotson somewhere says<sup>l</sup>, none would be willing to be surprised

<sup>k</sup> [Dr. Wall lived however six or seven years after writing this paragraph, dying in 1727, at the age of 82.]

<sup>l</sup> [Namely, in the preface to his sermon on Steadfastness in Religion, being the 49th in the first volume of the folio edition—His words are these: ‘For this reason a good man should not be very willing, when his Lord comes, to be found so doing; and as it were beating

‘his fellow-servants: and all controversy, as it is usually managed, is little better. A good man would be loth to be taken out of the world reeking hot from a sharp contention with a perverse adversary: and not a little out of countenance, to find himself in this temper translated into the calm and peaceable regions of the blessed, where nothing but perfect charity and good-will reign for ever.’

with death, viz., in the midst of a controversy, or reeking hot from one.

I would not have any one that shall write flatter himself, that they will let him have the last word, with what strength and evidence soever he write. I have some particular reasons to be satisfied that some monied men among them both have, and will again, if need be, contribute largely to keep the press at work. In which case, reasons and answers will never be wanting to authors.

There is, while I am writing this presage, a new instance given of the incessant attempts of their preachers to write against any thing that is said for their conviction; whether they have any thing rational in argument, or true in fact, to oppose to it, or not.

One Mr. Daye of Leicester, in a book called ‘The Baptism of Adult Believers only<sup>m</sup>,’ &c., undertakes to shew, that there have been antipædobaptists in ‘every age of the church’ from Christ’s and the apostles’ time till now. Which if he can do, he shall be the champion of their cause.

He saw this to be needful; because (as he observes) Christ’s church must have had a being in all ages. From which the true conclusion being, since many ages have been without ever an anti-pædobaptist, there must have been in all those ages a true church of pædobaptists: he, not liking this conclusion, labours, in spite of all history, to find some antipædobaptists in all the several ages.

This he declares in his preface to be the thing which he is *largest* on, and labours *chiefly to make out*. He does however treat of the arguments from Scripture; but owns, they have been ‘so fully and ‘nicely canvassed’ that they are come to their *ne plus ultra* in matter of argument. And, as he does not pretend, so he has not on that head any thing but what has been often considered. I shall pass most of that by. What he wishes to discourse of is their antiquity.

And for the first two hundred years, (i. e. after the apostles a hundred,) of which there are few books left, he depends upon the failure of proof given by the pædobaptists for the baptizing of

<sup>m</sup> [I have not been able to obtain a sight of this publication; therefore cannot answer for the correctness of the citations from it.

In Ivimey’s History of the Baptists there is the following brief notice of it and its author:

‘Mr. Stokes found an able antagonist

‘also in Mr. Thomas Davy, who published ‘a work of 158 pages, dated “Leicester, 29th September 1718,” entitled “The ‘baptism of adult believers only, asserted ‘and vindicated, and that of infants dis- ‘proved,” &c., with a postscript and ap- ‘pendix.’]

infants, and the testimonies of Scripture concerning adult persons baptized, that there was then no infant-baptism, all were antipædobaptists; and says, p. 52, 'that there is nothing of it to be found in the writings of St. Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, or Theophilus Antiochenus. In Tertullian's time, about the latter end of the second century, it began to appear,' &c.

For all this, I suppose, he depends upon Mr. Gale or some others of them. He himself would begin, where Mr. Gale ends, at the time of St. Cyprian. And there being for his time and the following (of which there is plenty of books) full proof of infant-baptism, he undertakes however to find some in every age that opposed it.

If there had been any such thing to be found, it would have been found before now, by some learned men that they have had.

Mr. Tombes reckons St. Cyprian's time to be the spring-head (as he calls it) of infant-baptism; and St. Austin's authority in after-times carried it 'almost without control.' And all the pretences of proof that any one then, or for many centuries after, did oppose to it, have been shewn to be gross mistakes. It could not be St. Austin's authority that carried it; because St. Austin says, he never knew, nor heard of, any that denied that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins. And Pelagius, who lived at the same time, owns, that he never heard of any that denied it to be given.

But as to its obtaining universally, Mr. Tombes need not have put in the word 'almost.' For for seven hundred years after St. Austin there is, in all the numerous books then written, no account of any church, any sect, any author, any Christian, that rejected it; nor none before Austin, but Tertullian.

Mr. Davye, after a slight attempt of expounding some words in a canon of the council of Neo-Cæsarea to the purpose of antipædobaptism (which have been fully shewed to be impertinent to it), and having recited some words of Balsamon's Comment on it, (but leaving out those in the same paragraph that speak directly of infant-baptism,) seeks for proofs on his side among the heretics of the following times; the Novatians, the Donatists, and the Pelagians.

He had before told his readers at p. 4, that one main part of the controversy between those sects on the one side, and St. Cyprian and St. Austin, &c., on the other side, was concerning infants' baptism. And whereas every one must wonder how he could venture to say this; after that Mr. Danvers had been so shamed for pre-

tending to proofs of it, and after it had appeared upon a diligent canvassing, that they never had one word of difference about that matter; he proves it there no otherwise than by saying, ‘I cannot but believe it was so.’ And so he says afterward at page 50, ‘to me it is apparent.’ But here he runs out into argument.

At page 9, 10, he reckons up several mischiefs of infant-baptism. One is, that ‘by this practice so many human inventions have been invented.’ Among which he reckons *chrism* and *unction* as two. And says, ‘none of which we read of in primitive antiquity for the first three hundred years at least after Christ.’

To such a writer there needs no other weapons but his own to overthrow him. For if *chrism* be one of the consequents of infant-baptism, who is there so ignorant as not to know that that was in use long before the times he speaks of?

He says there, the argument for infant-baptism from circumcision ‘was not insisted on by those called ancient Fathers.’ And though he might have instanced in some of them, who indeed do not mention its succeeding circumcision, he unluckily picks out for his only instances St. Cyprian and St. Austin, who are known to have mentioned it. But he says, it was not insisted on by them ‘for ought he finds.’ That salves all.

Page 15, he grants, that infants were church-members under the *pædagog*y of Moses; and page 16, that they were brought to the ordinance of the passover as soon as they were capable to eat it. And page 17, that under the Gospel ‘infants dying (he means all infants dying) are in the covenant of grace.’ And ten lines after, says, ‘Where faith, repentance, &c., are wanting in the recipients; there cannot be right church-membership; nor can they be in the covenant of grace; let men pretend what they please.’ And page 16, that ‘the *New Testament* church is wholly of a new frame;’ that we are not concerned now with what was done under the *Old Testament*. Forgetting that St. Paul tells the Gentile Christians that the *blessing of Abraham is come on them*; and that they who were of the wild olive-tree are grafted among the natural branches.

Here in ten pages he disputes against the independents. And it is pretty to see how they confute one another. He concludes with quotations from bishop Burnet, Dr. Whitby, Continuers of Pool’s Annotations, Assembly’s Annotations, &c. And what is most ridiculous, he quotes here and in twenty places more, bishop Taylor’s ‘*Liberty of Prophecyng*’; a book written in Oliver’s time to puzzle the schismatics then in power, by shewing that even the papists and anabaptists had as much to say for themselves as they



had; and produced their arguments, which himself shewed afterward to have no solidity in them.

Chap. ii. To disprove the Jewish baptism of proselytes, he transcribes Mr. Gale; and (what Mr. Gale thought not fit to do, since the place has been examined) sir Norton Knatchbull; and (not knowing who speaks for him, and who against him) Godwyn's 'Moses and Aaron,' which plainly asserts this custom of the Jews; and says, page 37, that he cannot understand, if the custom had been to baptize *proselytes*, why the Pharisees should ask John, why he baptized Jews.

On Matth. xix. 14, and 1 Cor. vii. 14, he brings over again some of the most trite pleas which the antipædobaptists have used in their descants on those texts.

There is nothing else in this chapter, but that he catches hold of that subtle and airy distinction of *fundamentals* which Mr. Gale, I think, has invented for them, whereby to justify their separation from the protestant churches, with whom they would yet seem to agree in all *fundamental* points of *faith*. It is a device which, I see, takes with them. He manages it, page 47, to this purpose:

'There are some things or doctrines, which, though they are not *fundamental* points of *religion*, or necessary to *salvation*; are yet *fundamental*, or essentially necessary, to the *constitution* of a *church*. And here we say, baptism is *fundamental*, or essentially *necessary*.'

And he says, 'baptism of infants by sprinkling (and I suppose he would say, by pouring water, or even dipping of them) is indeed no baptism. And therefore, though we honour them (the protestants) as *brethren*, love them as *children of God*, and *believers*, &c., yet we cannot join with them in a church state.'

They seem to have had some cue given them by somebody, that separate they must; or else they do nothing to purpose. And they strive for far-fetched pleas to justify their so doing. As for this new-invented one, it is the emptiest that ever was used to justify so great a sin and wickedness.

For it appears on the first weighing it, that any defect in baptism, if it does not hinder any single person from being a *Christian*, does not hinder a body of such as have that defect from being a *church*. If a man be once a Christian, there is no new use of baptism to make him a priest (or, as they call it, an elder), or to make him a bishop. So that if they were a number of Christians before, (which a new preacher would have to be the definition of a church,) they may without any new trial of the validity of their baptism have

church officers and be a *church* in the sense of that word which is acknowledged by all.

This author manages this argument a great deal more weakly than Mr. Gale himself did. He says, p. 48, 'It is proved by Heb. vi. 1, 2, 3, and Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, that baptism is fundamental to 'church-communion, and to the constitution of a *church*.' What those texts do speak of baptism tends to shew its necessity for one's being a Christian, or being saved; but they have nothing particular in reference to *communion*, or the constitution of a *church*.

And he has spoiled the whole argument by saying, 'We do not 'unchurch all other protestant churches.—There is scarce any thing 'more distant from our thoughts.'

Mr. Gale would not have taught him to have said so. He would have taught him to say; We do not *unchristian* them, or deny their salvation; but *unchurch* them we must; or else we cannot justify our separation; which is the main point of all.

The third chapter has (beside the common pleas which have been answered a hundred times) nothing new that is material, but these absurd propositions.

Page 49. That the doctrine of original sin began to be disputed *anno Dom. 250*.

Page 50. That the *Novatians* (which is true) and the *Donatists* (which is false) were before Constantine's time. Of both of them he says, that it is 'to him apparent,' that they before that time opposed the growing errors or heresies of the times. And, that the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* sprang from the *Novatians* and *Donatists*.

Page 54. That Mr. Wall (meaning me) confesses that Justin Martyr excludes infants from being baptized, and in the church; and says, that only adult persons can or ought to be baptized.

Mr. Davye had said in his preface, that he was not conscious that he had wronged any of the authors cited. By which it appears, he does some things that he is not conscious of.

Page 57. That St. Cyprian taught that the church of Rome was the mother-church. And here he quotes Daillé observing from St. Cyprian's fifty-ninth Epistle, that St. Cyprian thought the eucharist necessary to infants for their salvation. Which (as proved from that Epistle) has been shewn to be Mr. Daillé's oversight in reading *sacrificandum* for *sanctificandum*, admitted to the eucharist instead of *baptized*<sup>n</sup>. And though Mr. Davye was told of this, yet he had rather follow the oversight than consult the place.

<sup>n</sup> [See vol. i. p. 87.]

The eucharist was called a *sacrifice* ; but the recipients never were said to *be sacrificed*.

Page 58. That the *Novatians* and *Donatists* kept their distinct congregations from St. Cyprian's, because of his infant-baptism. This, as to infant-baptism, is as true of the *Donatists* who did not arise till near a hundred years after St. Cyprian was dead, as it is of the other, who in his time made a schism, but disputed not one word of infant-baptism.

Page 59. Having shewn that the *Novatians* differed from St. Cyprian in several other things, he infers, 'From all which we have *very great probability* on our side, that they rejected the baptism of infants.' This argument will fetch in the whole legion of heretics to be of Mr. Davye's side. For they, all of them, differed from St. Cyprian in many things.

Page 60. He cites one Gabriel Prateolus as saying of the *Novatians*, that they affirmed that infants did not stand in need of baptism°. He that will be at the pains to search the place in Prateolus, p. 125, will know which of the two, Prateolus, or Danvers, was the first that forged this on the *Novatians* (for Danvers once said this of them, and was soundly shamed for it): I do not think the reputation of either of them worth the pains.

From p. 61 to the end of the chapter, he pillages that chapter of my *History* wherein I mentioned some moderns who have made objections against the opinion of infant-baptism being used *generally* or *universally* from the beginning. Many of whom answered their own objections, or recanted them. But Mr. Davye recites their objections, and omits their answers; and so brings in Dr. Hammond and Mr. Baxter among the antipædobaptists; and bishop Taylor, who declared what he wrote to have been only some objections easy to be answered; and bishop Barlow, who had in his youth in a letter to Mr. Tombes said some things of the ancient history, which being without his knowledge printed long after, he recanted as having been written in the time of his ignorance. Yet Mr. Davye reprints the letter at large, but not the recantation; though he saw them both together in my book. And having recited out of Mr. Stennet a saying of one Vansleb concerning the ancient practice used at Alexandria, which has nothing of probability in it, nor is confirmed by any ancient historian; he, to put some mark of

° [The words of G. Prateolus in his book entitled 'De vitis, sectis, et dogmatibus omnium hæreticorum,' 4<sup>o</sup>. *Coloniæ* 1581, are, (he is speaking of the *Cathari*),

'Aiebant infantes absque peccato esse, ideoque non egere baptismo.']

p [Namely, part ii. chap. 2.]

antiquity on it, quotes Socrates for it, lib. vi. c. 7, 9. and lib. vii. c. 7. meaning, I suppose, Socrates the historian : but he might as well have cited Socrates the philosopher : one says no more of any such matter than the other. And this is Mr. Davye's way.

Chap. iv. He enters upon his task of bringing proofs that the Donatists were antipædobaptists. And having first premised, what I mentioned before, concerning the council of Neocæsarea and Balsamon, and coming to speak of his Donatists, he makes several gross mistakes of their tenets about other matters ; as that they rejected chrism, &c., p. 65, and then asserts of their tenets concerning infant-baptism things absolutely false ; as, that they held that infants ' needed not to be baptized,' p. 66. He quotes Vincentius (who held only that infants who had missed of baptism might yet by God's mercy be saved) as an antipædobaptist. He says, p. 67, ' That Fulgentius the Donatist and Cresconius denied infants' baptism, and asserted only that baptism which is after faith, as saith ' the Magdeburgensian history. Augustin also in his Epistle to ' Marcellus writes against them for denying baptism to infants.' And many other such strange things, copied, I think, mostly out of Danvers.

Now there is not one word of all this true. Neither St. Austin nor the Magdeburgenses have one syllable of what he here quotes from them. St. Austin has no epistle written to any one of that name. And Mr. Davye has given me the trouble of reading all his epistles to Marcellinus. In all which he has nothing about the Donatists, save that in one or two of them he entreats Marcellinus (the emperor's commissioner) in his court of judicature to abate of the rigour of the law against some of them that were convicted of sedition, outrage, and murder ; that the church might have the repute of moderation. Of their tenets about baptism not one word.

If these proofs will not do, he demands proofs of the other side from us that the Donatists were for infant-baptism. Several of us, and I for one, gave proofs from the councils of that time, and other evidences ; to which he has nothing to oppose.

Page 69. He would however get the Pelagians of his side. He owns that St. Austin speaks of them as allowing and practising infant-baptism ; though they denied original sin. But he says, ' I ' cannot help hesitating a little about it.' And because they said that an infant dying unbaptized may have an eternal life somewhere, though not in the kingdom of heaven, (into which, as they confessed, no infants but baptized ones could enter,) he thinks ' it ' can hardly be believed they were for infant-baptism.'



He concludes a little more modestly, that if what he says of Pelagius be not a proof, it must be allowed for a strong probability ; and says, ‘for my own part, I believe, he and his followers were ‘for believers’ baptism only.’——So the bell chinketh.

Page 70, he questions whether Pelagius’ creed, and Celestius’ *Confessio Fidei*, of which I gave copies out of St. Austin, be genuine. And what is worse, says, it may be questioned by my confession. They were authentical pieces sent or given by them in their own defence to the bishops of Rome. No man can suppose, even if he thought St. Austin to be a forger, that he would forge or mis-recite public records kept at Rome.

Page 71, he would prove, from some canons or synodical epistles of the councils of Carthage and Milevis, anno 416, directed against the Pelagians, that the Pelagians or some people of that time opposed the baptism of infants ; because those canons do, as he says, anathematize some that did oppose it.

Now there wants nothing but the reading of the canons and epistles, by any one that can read them, to see that they do not speak of any that opposed it ; but only of some that thought it must not be given to *new-born* infants before the eighth day ; and of some others (viz., the Pelagians) who denied that any original sin derived from Adam was forgiven to infants in it.

Page 72, he says, those against whom these canons were made must have held, that infants, though unbaptized, might enter into the kingdom of heaven.

The distinction the Pelagians made between an eternal life somewhere, and the kingdom of heaven, is beyond Mr. Davye’s skill. They held that infants who missed of baptism might have an *eternal life* somewhere, they knew not where, as being without sin ; but that baptized infants did enter into the *kingdom of heaven*, as being not only without sin, but also regenerated in Christ.

Page 75. For the following centuries, he finds that the council of Gerunda decreed, that infants newly born, if sick, or not able to suck the breast, should be baptized, though it were not Easter time. Would any one but he conclude from hence, that either the bishops of that council or any one else of that time denied that they were to be baptized at all ?

Another synod Mr. Davye has found quoted.

The Bracarenian synod in the seventh century condemned the errors of the Manichees and Priscillianists. Now Cassander says, that in the twelfth century in Bernard’s time, arose the Albigenses, who to the rest of their errors borrowed from the Manichees and

Priscillianists, added this, that the baptism of little ones is unprofitable.

From hence this notable arguer concludes that there were anti-pædobaptists in the *seventh century*; whereas the proof is only of the *twelfth*, when some people holding some ancients errors added to them this of anti-pædobaptism.

Chap. v. p. 77. Having renewed that absurd pretence of Danvers, that the old Britons denied infant-baptism, and quoted nothing for it, but that edition of Fabian<sup>9</sup> which Danvers had lighted on, (wherein the misprinting of three words makes all the mistake,) he concludes, page 81 :

‘ If all this will not be allowed for proof,—I must let my ‘ opposers enjoy their contrary opinions; it is not much material, ‘ —yet I must tell the reader, these considerations weigh with ‘ *me*, to make *me* believe these Britons were really for believers’ ‘ baptism only.’

It is an advantage to have a faculty of believing what one will, with reason or without.

Page 81. For an evidence in the ninth century, he is not ashamed to bring upon the stage again that blunder which Danvers made in the story of Hincmarus<sup>r</sup>, bishop of Laudun; which has been exposed even to ridicule. And finding in Danvers’ book the *Bibliotheca Patrum* and the *Magdeburgenses* quoted for things not there to be found, he copies the quotations just as they were in Danvers.

A thing that he did not think of here, but argues at large in his recapitulation, at page 122, and says, he cannot omit it, is a manifest instance of his venturing to affirm confidently matters of fact which he only guesses at, and which are not true. He observes that I in my Preface do say, that St. Austin has whole books against the Pelagians, wherein he proves the doctrine of original sin from the practice of infant-baptism.

Mr. Davye positively asserts the contrary, viz., that *from* the doctrine of original sin in infants St. Austin infers the necessity of their baptism; and says, ‘ his works do plainly shew this to every ‘ reader.’ And, that mine is a ‘ wrong construction’ of them. And, that he ‘ vehemently in several places condemns the Pelagians for ‘ suffering infants to die without baptism.’

Could any man, in a thing that had been true, and which he had read himself, have expressed a greater confidence than he does in

<sup>9</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 410, for the difference of reading in several editions.]

<sup>r</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 476.]

this, which is notoriously untrue? Every man that has read any thing of St. Austin against the Pelagians, (if it were only those places which I quoted, which are not the hundredth part,) must see with his own eyes that St. Austin all along, and many times over, speaks of the Pelagians as owning and practising infant-baptism; and argues with them, that the custom used by the whole church and by themselves of baptizing infants ought to convince them, that they have original sin which needs to be washed away.

Mr. Davye says, this is not a *congruous* way of arguing; nor to reason with them like men of sense. 'Is not,' says he, 'the same argument used against us now? And do not the pædobaptists argue *from* original sin to the necessity of infant-baptism? The other is a thwarting way of arguing, and very unlikely.'

But, good Mr. Davye, if there be something which may be seen with one's own eyes by any one that will be at the pains to go and see it; and some do go and see it; for you to sit at home, and guess by *congruities* and *likelihoods*, how the thing must be; and not only to disbelieve them that have seen it, but to face them down that they give wrong accounts; is to take too great a liberty to yourself. What will become of your credit, even with your own party, if these books of St. Austin should be translated into English; or if any of them be able to read them in Latin? The pædobaptists do indeed argue with you *from* your confession of original sin, to convince you of the necessity of baptism to infants; and good reason; because you do (many of you) *own* the former, but *deny* the latter. St. Austin argues with the Pelagians *from* their confession of infant-baptism to convince them of the doctrine of original sin, with the like congruity on the other side; because they (not some, but all of them) did *own* infant-baptism, but *deny* original sin. And whereas you say here, that he 'vehemently in several places' condemns them for suffering infants to die without baptism; bring one of those places; or else take shame to yourself, and never meddle any more in matters of antiquity which you understand not. In the mean while you may read, if you please, the places that I have brought in my History, part i. chap. 19, where you will find Pelagius, Cælestius, and Julian, owning the necessity of infant-baptism, (not for the cure of original sin from Adam indeed, but for entering the kingdom of heaven,) and some of them anathematizing any that should deny it, if there were any such; but they say, they never heard of any that did. One of them says, he never knew any one *so ignorant* or *so impious* as to say, or to have a thought, that infants are not to be baptized. Another allots an *eternal anathema*

to any one that should say it is not *necessary for infants*. And see if you can find me misquoting or misrepresenting the words of my author in any of those places; a course too common with you.

You go upon *congruities*. When you at one place insinuate of St. Austin that he forged those confessions of the Pelagians wherein they own infant-baptism; do you think that *congruous*, that the same man should represent them as owning it, and yet vehemently condemn them as disowning it?

Page 83. Mr. Davye comes at last to the twelfth century, the time of the Waldenses and Albigenses. Some of the later (viz., the Petrobrusians) did indeed (as I among others, have shewn) deny baptism to infants: the first body of people in the world, that we read of, that did so.

After all, I know not how it happens, but I cannot be very angry with Mr. Davye. A man that writes in such a fashion as can do nobody any hurt, (because he discovers at the very first sight that he has no skill in the things he talks of, nor has taken any care of the truth of his quotations,) does not near so much provoke one's indignation, as one that in a more plausible and cautious manner perverts the truth. A reader is apt to make allowances for the temper of a man, his incapacity, and his open way.

—————Hunc ego fatis

Imputo, qui vultu morbum incessuque fatetur.

Mr. Gale spoke of somebody that should answer my book. Was it Mr. Davye? Was he to account for the times after St. Cyprian with as much success as the other had done for those before? It may seem so. For he concludes, p. 140, as Mr. Gale uses to do: 'All which, I think, has been made apparent in the preceding treatise; which may be a sufficient answer to——and to the historical part of Mr. Wall's book of infant-baptism.'

I crave pardon of my brethren, the clergy, for inserting this digression about Mr. Davye's book, (which is just come to my hand, and which I am satisfied they will never read over,) in the address I was making to them. It is to convince them of what I was saying; that if any of them do write in this cause, the antipædobaptists will never suffer him to have the last word. For if such an answer as this can find one that will print it, and men that will buy and read it, the antipædobaptists will never want authors.

I crave leave to go on with a few words to the clergy.



I hope those that shall write in defence of infant-baptism will not drop, or suffer to sink, the argument from antiquity ; now that we have carried it so far, and produced plain evidence of its use among Christians, from authors so nigh the apostles' time.

There are, beside the time spent in arguing, disputing, and talking each man for his side of a question, (in which eagerness seldom suffers men to weigh things soberly and impartially. But there are, I say, beside these,) times, in which every serious man considers the reasons and proofs of things by himself. Now a man that does this, will see it impossible to be conceived, that in a practice so public and notorious as baptism is, they whose fathers or grandfathers lived *in the apostles' time*, should not know what was done *in that time*, as to this matter.

The testimonies so far up, as to a hundred and fifty years after *that time*, they do now yield and own ; and make, I think, but very weak opposition against those which are brought from authors within the hundred. They that have formerly been told by their leaders, that the baptizing of infants began under such or such a pope of Rome, will see things with another view, when in following the plain footsteps of it, they come, not only up to Constantine's time, but do pass or shoot the gulf, as I may call it, that is between that and the age of martyrs ; and can trace it there as plainly as in the ages below. They yield Cyprian. I have, if I do not flatter myself, vindicated the testimonies of Origen ; and of Irenæus, who was born in or about the end of the apostolic times. Higher they cannot expect to have the express mention of so particular a thing, for want of books between that and the Scripture-times.

There is indeed one of our own order, one by profession of the church of England, who has meddled in this point, and has to our disgrace said in print, page 15, that 'till Cyprian's time none but 'adult persons were baptized ; and even in his time baptizing of 'infants was very rare.' One would wonder what should make him say this, or from whom he had it. He himself, I can easily guess, knows little of the matter. He has either shot his bolt blindfold, or else he has had it from somebody. It could not be his father, he never lighted on *that* paradox. I do not think he has it from the man whose cause he is there defending. He, for a very good reason, avoids any talk of the tenets of 'those weak men in several 'ages.' Mr. Le Clerc, or any of that sort, have not said any such thing that I know of. Let me be far enough, if I do not think he has taken it on trust from Mr. Gale ; and thinking it might help, among the other odd things that he has said, to do some prejudice

to the church of England, has put it in at all adventure. If I guess right, that he has learned it of Mr. Gale; he is a pregnant scholar, and has already outshot his master. For even *he* never ventured to say that in St. Cyprian's time it was rare.

To those that shall write to enforce the arguments *from Scripture*, I would humbly recommend one advice or two.

One is, that although many of the late English writers in defence of infant-baptism have thought fit to omit the arguments from John iii. 3, 5, and from 1 Cor. vii. 14, yet they would not be discouraged from using them. A right translation, and explication of the words, in those two texts, would contribute much to satisfy the doubts concerning the baptizing of infants.

In explaining the sense of both of them there is an instance how much the alteration (which happens in process of time) of the use and meaning of words in common language, does, with illiterate men, weaken the force of an argument taken from a text of Scripture or any ancient book, where any words are used that have had their use so altered.

I consider who I am speaking to now. And to them I do not think it needful to say any thing concerning the ancient meaning of the word *regenerate*, or *born again*; or of the words *saints*, or *sanctified*. Whereas I and Mr. Whiston and several others have positively affirmed that the word *regenerate* is in the ancient phrase used constantly (or, as Mr. Whiston cautiously expresses it, *almost constantly*), in relation to baptism; and Mr. Gale has so positively denied this; that he, or else we, must be guilty of a notorious untruth in matter of fact; I speak now to those that know, or can know when they please, by minding, as they read the ancient books, where that guilt settles.

They know also how new, and unheard of in the ancient church, that interpretation of some late expositors is, who by *water*, in John iii. 5, would have us understand not *material water*, but some mystical thing; such as our Saviour compared to water in his discourse with the Samaritan woman, John iv. 13, 14: and by *saints*, 1 Cor. vii. 14, not *Christians*, or *persons christened*, (which is St. Paul's constant use of the word,) but *children, saints*, or *holy*, i. e. *born holy* by a holiness previous to their baptism: and by *sanctified*, (when a heathen wife is sanctified by her husband a Christian,) not converted to Christianity, and brought to baptism; but the man is sanctified *to his wife*, i. e. the husband 'potest bona conscientia uti infidelis conjugis vase.'

Beza, one of the first that gave that interpretation, adds, after he has said this, 'This place makes against the Catabaptists' (which is his name for antipædobaptists). It did so indeed, till he marred it by his wonderful explication, which the antipædobaptists are so far from thinking to make against them, that they have taken it into their scheme; only improving *born holy*, i. e. in covenant, into *born holy*, i. e. not bastards.

If those two texts were read in the ancient sense, (which I think may be made out to be the true one,) the one, *Except any one be born of water, &c.*, i. e. baptized into the religion of Christ, *he cannot enter, &c.*, (always understanding this to be a rule in *God's ordinary way*; not to limit his mercy in cases extraordinary); and the other, *an unbelieving husband has been sanctified* (i. e. brought to Christianity and baptism) *by his wife, &c.*, *else your children would have been unclean*, i. e. brought up heathens; *but now they are ἅγιοι, saints*, i. e. *Christians*, or *christened*, or *dedicated to Christ by baptism*; the dispute would be at an end.

Dr. Hammond, whose treatise on this subject in his 'Six Queries' it is advisable for any clergyman that studies this point to read, was the first of the moderns who retrieved the sense of this latter text from the unnatural glosses of some late writers. He did it by observing what is the constant use of the word *saints* and *sanctified* in the language of the New Testament, viz., *Christians*. I have shewn that several ancients (before there was any dispute of infant-baptism) do paraphrase it just as he does. Which must needs be a great confirmation.

It was perhaps not without reason that the Christians of the middle times left off the phrase of calling the men of their profession *saints*; because the word was abused by some sectaries who made an hypocritical cant of it, to distinguish themselves by. But yet when we read any text of the New Testament, or of any ancient Christian book written while that word was in constant use; we must take the words *saints*, and *sanctified*, or made saints, as it was used at that time; or else we lose the sense of the place.

Mr. Bingham, who to a very good purpose makes it his business to acquaint us with the general customs and use of words among the ancient Christians, does in his book i. chap. 1. p. 3, (without having any discourse or any thought at that place of infant-baptism, or of this text,) give us this account:

'The names ἅγιοι, πιστοὶ, ἐκλεκτοὶ, &c., occur frequently in ancient ecclesiastical writers; and signify, not any select number of Christ-

'ians (as now the words *saints*, and *elect*, are often used to signify only the predestinate); but *all Christians* in general who were entered into the communion of the church by the waters of baptism. For so Theodoret and others explain the word ἅγιοι, *saints*, to be such as were vouchsafed the honour and privilege of baptism.' Theodor. Comm. in Phil. i. 1.

It is but reasonable then to let the word have here the sense that it always had in those times. And then it will be; 'Now are your children vouchsafed the honour of baptism;' or, 'entered into the communion of the church by the waters of baptism.'

All the difficulty is, for a minister to satisfy the vulgar people, who understand no other phrase but that of their own times, and of the common translations, of the matter of fact; that this was the ancient sense of the words. They are shy of any thing that is told them more than they see in the translation; especially if they have any writer of their side, that will confidently tell them that it was not so. The word was not so used, &c.

Whether they will find any that will deny the word *saints* to be used by St. Paul for *Christians*, I know not. But I know of one that has denied things as plain and certainly true as that is, in cases where he knew they could not search the books. If there be such a necessity, they must be shewed the several places where St. Paul uses the word *saints*; which if they read with attention, they will see by the sense of the place that it is there (as also in the Creed) put instead of the word *Christians*.

One other thing I would recommend, which will be more obviously conceived by all ordinary readers of Scripture. And that is, that those who have an occasion to argue on this matter, do keep their antagonists, or any whom they would convince, close to that question or consideration; *how*, or by *what means*, or by *what merit*, or *title*, infants do ever obtain the kingdom of heaven. There is no method of arguing or of meditation that will sooner bring an antipædobaptist to think rightly of this matter than this; if it be well pursued in his own thoughts, or by the conduct of a Christian guide.

If he be a man at all versed in the Scripture, and in the mystery of the salvation of mankind, as there taught; he will presently understand and grant, that it is *by Christ*, *by his merits*, *his purchase*, &c. that there is no way by which any of human race can come to that kingdom, but by an interest in him.

Mr. Gale indeed talks, p. 270, with great confidence of the state of all infants, that they must needs go to heaven, as having no actual sin, by virtue of God's general justice and mercy ('If there



‘be any mercy in God, &c., God our Saviour cannot ordain such unreasonable laws,’ &c.; and such like rants). But no pious and well studied Christian, antipædobaptist or other, will think or speak at this rate of the kingdom of heaven, as any one’s natural right, or to be conferred on any, but by Christ, and for his sake; by virtue of his merits and death.

They must be urged then to consider, that the infants as well as the adult, who are admitted thither, must be *members of Christ*, united to him *by the Holy Spirit*, included in his *covenant and purchase*, of his *fold*, his *kingdom*, his *peculium*, his *body*; *fellow-heirs*, as St. Paul expresses it, *and of the same body*, and *partakers of God’s promise in Christ through the Gospel*; *such as obtain an inheritance among them that have been sanctified* (ἡγιασμέρους, as the word is in both the places where that phrase is used, Acts xx. 32, and xxvi. 18); that is, among *the Christians* that have been baptized; not *strangers or foreigners*, but *fellow-citizens with the saints*, or *Christians, and of the household of God*. To say of any one, that he shall enter the kingdom, is as much as to say all this of him.

These terms signify neither more nor less, than being of *his church*, which the Scripture calls *his body*; and him *the Saviour of the body*. The consideration that infants are capable of being admitted to these spiritual privileges, (which admission is the same in substance with that *spiritual grace* or favour which makes the *inward* and *spiritual* part of the sacrament of baptism,) will easily incline any one that considers it, to believe that they are capable of the *outward* part, which is but the seal of the other. Who can forbid water to those who are capable of receiving with the water such spiritual favours as well as we? Since our Saviour has established the terms of his covenant so ample and merciful, as to include them, and to testify his love and tender regard to them; and has bid us suffer them to be brought to him; who are we, that we should exclude them from the outward tokens of his favour, as if they did not *belong to him* and to *his kingdom*?

I wish some good man would be at the charge of an impression of a small picture, that might be given to such as need instruction and satisfaction concerning the will and purpose of our Saviour in this matter. The proverb is true, that pictures have with vulgar men the use of books; especially if they represent some useful history of the Gospel, such as this which I am going to recommend, is, being recited by three Evangelists, Matt. xviii. 5, Mark ix. 37, Luke ix. 48, our Saviour holding a little child in his arms, and saying to his disciples, *Whosoever shall receive this child* (in Matthew and Mark

it is, *one such little child* ; or, one of such children) *in my name receiveth me.*

If our Saviour be drawn in that posture, holding forth the child in his arms, and those words subscribed, *Whosoever shall receive such a child in my name receiveth me* ; and over against him be drawn two men standing by a font, both pretending to be ministers of Christ ; and some people offering such a child to them ; and one of them reaching out his arms to receive it, and the other thrusting it back : I would fain see what countenance the painter will give to that man, who seeing our Saviour look upon him, and hearing him say those words, does dare to reject it.

The ordinary meaning of the word *receive* in the books of the New Testament, even when it stands alone, is well known to all readers of Scripture, to be, to receive or admit to a brotherhood, or fellowship in Christianity ; as (to name one place of forty) Rom. xv. 7, St. Paul commands those dissenters in opinions to *receive one another.*

But when Christ does moreover add here those words, *in my name* ; it more plainly still imports that they should be received to be as *his members, his children, belonging to him* ; or, as I once before deduced the import of the like phrase, as τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες ; being *Christ's, or Christians.*

And the sanction here given to the command of such a receiving of them is the highest that is ever given : even the same that is given to the command of *receiving* the apostles themselves. For as it was said to them, *He that receiveth you receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me* ; so the very same is said here of *receiving children in his name.*

The dispute is concerning a considerable part of Christ's flock : and it is, whether they shall be admitted into his fold, or not. The infants of mankind, taken together with all such as are under the age at which the antipadobaptists receive them, do make, I believe, a third part of the whole people.

Our blessed Saviour will certainly at his coming be *much displeased* (for he was so once upon earth on a like occasion) either with us for *receiving* them, or else with them for *rejecting* them. It behoves us all therefore to mind what things displeased him here ; and with such care and impartiality to study and learn his true will and meaning ; and with such sincerity to follow it ; and for our performance of both these things, so to implore his heavenly direction and assistance, *that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.* Amen.

## POSTSCRIPT.

SOME of the antipædobaptist writers do give us occasion to observe the great mischief to religion that comes by any one's forging words, and attributing them in print to any ancient father: so great, that though the first forger should repent, and publicly recant what he has said; yet the mischief and ill consequence would continue by ignorant men's taking him at his first word, and commonly adding to it.

Justin Martyr is (a very few excepted) the eldest of the Christians whose books are left to us. He was born in the apostles' time, and wrote about forty years after it. A testimony of his is more considerable than of five or six later ones. Any words of his, that should plainly and expressly determine, either *for* or *against* infant-baptism, would be a more material and decisive evidence than any that has as yet been produced from antiquity on either side. The greater must the impiety be of any writer in this controversy, who should forge such decisive words in his name.

Mr. Gale writing his 'Reflections' on a passage which I had cited out of Justin's apology, (where he speaks of some circumstances, used at the baptizing of adult converts,) adds these words, at his page 292:

'St. Justin here mentions only adult persons: and elsewhere 'plainly excludes infants from being then baptized in the church; and says, that "adult persons only can or ought to be baptized."' This, if true, is a very positive evidence.

Mr. Davye, having mentioned the same passage of Justin, and knowing nothing to the contrary, but that what Mr. Gale had farther attributed to him might be true, recites Mr. Gale's words, (as if they were from his own knowledge or reading,) and adds to them another forgery, of *my confessing* the thing to be so: in these words, at his page 54:

'St. Justin mentions only adult persons, and (*elsewhere*, as Mr. Wall himself confesses) excludes infants from being baptized, and 'in the church; and says, "that only adult persons can or ought to be baptized."'

If Mr. Gale can produce no such words of St. Justin, (as I am confident he cannot,) and Mr. Davye can produce no such 'confession' of mine, (as I am sure he cannot,) they are both of them forgers of evidences. And it concerns not only the cause of religion

and truth in general, but particularly the credit of the antipædobaptists, that they be called to account, whether they can or not: and if they cannot, that they be disowned. Otherwise they will be worse than the papists: for whereas some impostors formerly did, for the maintenance of popery, forge *decretal epistles*, under the name of bishops as ancient as Justin Martyr; they were credited for some time: but when the cheat came to be detected, all the honest papists did themselves join in condemning and exposing it; and they now disown, and are ashamed of the epistles.

I did, as I passed along, take notice of this foul dealing of both of them, at page 485, and page 625, of this ‘Defence.’ But I had a mind to give a *memorandum* of it here by itself. Because the attempt being extraordinary; and the evidence for the antiquity of antipædobaptism far more considerable, if it be a true one, than ever was heard of; it is pity but it should be brought to light, and into a fair view. I do not know whether Mr. Davye can find the place in Justin’s works; but Mr. Gale can, if it be there.

THE END.





## INDEX

## 1

- [illegible]

...the ... of ...

Students will be able to identify the components of a sentence and use them to create their own sentences.

\_\_\_\_\_

— *Members of the 92d Congress have overwhelmingly approved the reauthorization of the law.*

[illegible]

Source: *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1977, 7, 1-10.

Copyright © 2003 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Casey, Robert. "The 'New' American Novel." *Journal of American Studies* 10 (1976): 1-15.

... ..

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

Review Article concerning the Editor

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

© 2000 Blackwell Science Ltd  
Journal of Internal Medicine 247: 395–402

[illegible]Alexander W. Cooley, *Ph.D.*, is a professor of political science at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

See Table 2, p. 10.

Alexander P. Thurston, Jr.,  
 President, 1990-1991

...the church of St. John.

the present study, the mean age of the participants was 20.5 years, and the mean age of the participants in the study by Knapik et al. (2006) was 22.5 years. The mean age of the participants in the study by Knapik et al. (2006) was 22.5 years, and the mean age of the participants in the present study was 20.5 years. The mean age of the participants in the study by Knapik et al. (2006) was 22.5 years, and the mean age of the participants in the present study was 20.5 years.

Allen, Wm., two books of his commended by Rd. Baxter, i. 680.

Allix, Dr. P., i. 495, 523, 645. ii. 399, 559. his dissertation on Tertullian, i. 64. his notes on Dr. Wall's introduction, ii. 383, his work on the time of our Saviour's birth, 568, 569.

Alting, Jacobus, i. 3.

Alvarez, Fr., i. 590, 637.

Alypius, was baptized together with St. Augustine, i. 407. his character, *ibid.*

'*Ἀμαρτία* and *ἀμαρτήμα* signify *actual sin*, i. 146.

Ambrose, St., i. 18, 49, 435, 436, 450, 453, 600, 640. ii. 362, 551. his testimonies on baptism, i. 138-141. quoted, 210, 279. his ghost said to appear, 216. his commentaries, 292, 313. is persecuted by Valentinian, 370, 371. sent as a mediator to Maximus, 372. his funeral oration on Valentinian, 373, 392, 393. and on Theodosius, 373, 374. cited, 414. account of him, 391. is elected bishop before his baptism, 392. why not baptized in infancy, 392-394.

Ammianus Marcellinus, i. 370.

Amphilochius, his life of St. Basil, i. 377. that which goes under the name is a forgery, *ibid.*

Anabaptists, the meaning of the word, i. 414. do not own themselves rebaptizers, 420. a 'short history' of them published in 1642, 525.

Anabaptists of Munster, ii. 397, 484. of Holland, 410, 464.

Anacharsis, ii. 195.

'*Ἀνακτισμός*, used to denote *baptism*, i. 43.

Anastasius, bishop of Rome, i. 70, 195, 207.

Anaxagoras, ii. 183.

Anaximenes, ii. 182.

Angiers, the synod of, i. 576.

Anianus the deacon, a Pelagian, i. 217.

Anne, queen, eulogized for the Toleration act, ii. 56, 57, 299.

Anointing used in baptism, i. 416, 598, 599, 600, 601.

Anselm, i. 460.

Anthony, St., his picture at Padua, ii. 158.

Antusa, the mother of Chrysostom, i. 389, 390.

Antioch, the council of, i. 604, 621.

Antipædobaptists (see also *Anabaptists*), i. 13, 14, 34, 41, 43, 62, 63, 67. some would allege that the use of the word *man*, in John iii. 5, excludes

infants from baptism. There were none in the Greek church in the twelfth century, 97. their interpretation of the passage 1 Cor. vii. 14, 114, 116. the opinion entertained by some moderns on the origin of the soul, 186. are unfair quoters, 204. none were ever heard of by Augustin, by Pelagius, or Cœlestius, 237, 238, 279, 289. quote the early Fathers as opposers of infant-baptism, 332, 333. what is their strongest argument, 360. their argument about Nectarius falls to the ground, 388. that about Chrysostom, 389. about St. Ambrose, 392. they reject the name of 'anabaptists,' 414. therefore Dr. Wall never calls them by it, *ibid.* their interpretation of the text John iii. 5, 444, 446, 447. they use it against Quakers and others, 448. their opinion of unbaptized infants, 471. claim the Waldenses as on their side, 480, 481, 485. hold that *all* infants are saved, 492. no national church ever held the doctrine of antipædobaptism, 505, 513. some few individuals in different countries hold these opinions, *ibid.* 513. as, in Germany, beginning in 1522, *ibid.* in the Low Countries, 514, 515. whether the practice were then new, 515. the protestants disown the sect, 518. but few are left in Germany, *ibid.* they are favourably received in the Low Countries, *ibid.* their disorders there, *ibid.* the Minnists and their divisions, 519, &c. some Dutchmen of that opinion in England, 522, 527. the convocation, A. D. 1536, takes notice of the opinion, 523. some Dutch burnt in London, 524, 527. their proceedings in England during the reigns of Henry VIII., 525. of Edward VI., *ibid.* of Mary, 526. of Elizabeth, 527. not numerous till about the year 1641, 528. the first book written in favour of their tenets, *ibid.* they are encouraged by Oliver Cromwell, 529. their address to king Charles II, 530. their confession of faith, A. D. 1644, 532, 533. their state in our author's time, 533. their general good character, *ibid.* charged to be concerned in the duke of Monmouth's plot, *ibid.* they decreased during Charles II.'s reign; but afterwards increased; chiefly in the eastern parts of England; and in London and its suburbs, 534. their tenets on many points besides denying infants' baptism, 535. viz. they

separate from all other Christians, *ibid.* require complete immersion as an essential, *ibid.* do not baptize naked, 539. their indifference as to the form, *ibid.* many Socinians among them, *ibid.* some few (of this kind) hold that Christ took not flesh from the Virgin Mary, 540. they expect a personal reign of Christ with the saints for a thousand years, 545. abstain from blood and things strangled, *ibid.* an opinion ascribed to *some few* among them, that the souls of infants die with their bodies, 551. this denied of the great body, *ibid.* one party deny any sleep of the soul, *ibid.* many of them reject psalm-singing, 552. some reject the Lord's Prayer, *ibid.* some use extreme unction, *ibid.* a peculiar way of marriage used by some of them, *ibid.* receive the Lord's supper in a sitting posture, 553. some are sabbatarians, *ibid.* differ among themselves about confirmation, *ibid.* on prædestination some hold the opinion of Arminius, and are called *general* baptists; others, that of Calvin, and are called *particular*, 554. their schisms and divisions on this ground, *ibid.* many of the *general* sort are Pelagians, *ibid.* individuals among them are Socinians, 555. their 'confession of faith,' *ibid.* a more recent one, 555, 675. their 'general assembly,' 555, 559. they love public disputings about religion, 557. with the Quakers, *ibid.* their form of church-government, 558. their mode of settling differences among themselves, 560. their treatment of immoral or scandalous members, *ibid.* some Jesuits have crept in amongst them, 562. account of them in Poland, 568. in Bohemia and Moravia, &c., 569. in Hungary and Transylvania, *ibid.* whether or not they are schismatical in separating from the church of England, 672. they admit that the differences between it and them are not of the *essentials* of religion, 675, 676. particulars of their 'confession of faith,' 675. 686. 'articles' drawn up by them in 1702, 676. these approach very near to the Articles of the church of England, *ibid.* they ought to join in communion with the church of England, 677. and we ought to communicate with them, *ibid.* no national church of them, 678. when the separation began in England, *ibid.* they ought to unite with the church, 681. diffi-

culties in their way, 682-687. what persons alone they admit to the Lord's supper, 686. a good character given of them by the author, 688. earnest advice to them, *ibid.* Mr. Gale complains that they are traduced as enemies to the state, ii. 5. they are loyal to the sovereign, 6. Balsamon and Zonaras speak rather against infant-baptism, 29. the term *antipædobaptist* adopted by Dr. Wall, *ibid.* the controversy between them and the church of England consists of two heads, 59. their practice of dipping agreeable to scripture and primitive antiquity, *ibid.* Mr. Gale states the case between the church of England and them, 50, &c. Dr. Wall seems to suppose them to be in the right, 51, 53, 636. Mr. Gale justifies their separation, i. 384, 386. they were once considered a very strange and mischievous party, 477. the controversy will do good, *ibid.* an amicable adjustment desirable, perhaps practicable, *ibid.* Socinians amongst them, 511. ii. 479. their mode of receiving the Lord's supper, 371. how far they admit the force of the Jewish baptism of proselytes, 382. Dr. Wall vindicates his manner of speaking of them, 400. always wished to treat them with civility, 401, 479, 484. the confession of their churches, 410, 413, 654. their differences among themselves, 412. they pay no regard to ecclesiastical authority, 416. they never had a national church in any part of the world, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's reply to the assertion that he allowed them to be in the right, 418, 636. some few of them very uncharitable, 419, 420, 636, 655. antipædobaptism probably would decrease, if the custom of *dipping* were restored, 464, 641, &c. first arose in France, or Germany; or Geneva; and why, 464, 629, 642. none in England when the English version of the Bible was made, 498. it has sprung in a great measure from the change in the ancient manner of baptizing, 642, &c. three sorts of antipædobaptists, and how a clergyman ought to conduct himself towards each sort, 649, &c. their history, *ibid.*

Antiphon, ii. 179.

Antoninus, Marcus, quoted, ii. 82, 83, 231, 509.

Apelles, i. 540.

Apollinarians, i. 408.



- Apollinaris, i. 271.  
 Apollinarius, i. 541.  
 Apostasy, when it may be said to have begun, ii. 637, &c.  
 Apostles, their careful choice of successors, i. 437. they knew precisely the age of our Saviour, ii. 299. employed themselves in *teaching* much more than in *baptizing*, 496.  
 Apostolicals, i. 483, 493, 499.  
*Apprentice*. This word may illustrate the meaning of the word *μαθητής*, ii. 495.  
 Aquileia, the creed of, i. 269, note.  
 Aquinas, Thomas, his quotation of a passage in St. Austin, i. 252, 461, 463, 575.  
 Aratus, quoted, ii. 77.  
 Archelaus, a natural philosopher, ii. 182.  
 Archelaus, son of Herod, ii. 572, 574, 575.  
 Archontici, an ancient sect, i. 419.  
 Argobastes, a noble of the Greek court, i. 372. his death, 373, 374.  
 Arians, i. 117. the catholics would not baptize them, 117, 125. their dealing with the emperor Valens, 136. some of their opinions, 269, 271, 272. favoured by the Greek emperors, 370, &c. 615. they rebaptized catholics, 374, 414. their disputes, 432, 433. they accuse the catholics of Sabellianism, 433, 435. are by some called anabaptists, 414, 527. did not oppose infant-baptism, 414. some of the Dutch Minnists were Arians, 521. some of their opinions, 612. their creeds, 613, 614. partly approved the Nicene Creed, 615. often altered their creeds, 617. go beyond their founder, 619. ii. 22, 385.  
 Arias Montanus, ii. 200.  
 Ariminum, a council at, i. 623.  
 Aristobulus, his treatment of the Itureans, ii. 510.  
 Aristophanes, quoted, ii. 66, 68. his scholiast, 69, 72, 73, 74, 78. ii. 430.  
 Aristotle, quoted, i. 96, 186. ii. 66, 67, 68, 75, 78, 79, 115, 194, 426, 448, 492.  
 Arius, his first secession from the church, i. 432, 612, 613, 615, 616, 619.  
 Arles, council of, i. 129. some Petrobrosians in the province of, 502.  
 Armenian Christians, i. 506. baptize infants, 508. and give them the eucharist, *ibid.* 513, 637.  
 Arminian tenets differ from Pelagian, i. 231. their tenets as expressed at the synod of Dort, *ibid.*  
 Arnold of Brescia, a follower of Peter Bruis, condemned by the Lateran council, i. 496.  
 Arnoldists, i. 483.  
 Arrian the philosopher, ridicules the Jews, i. 6. ii. 228, 231, 232, 233, 340, 514.  
 Arsenius, his scholia on Euripides, ii. 65.  
 Artemon, a heretic, i. 124.  
 Articles of the Church of England, i. 676. ii. 53, 149, 150, 309. See *Burnet*.  
 Ascher, rabbi, ii. 225.  
 Asclepiades, ii. 179.  
 Ascodruti, an ancient sect, i. 419.  
 Asphaltites, the lake, ii. 80.  
 Assembly's Annotations, ii. 659.  
 Athanasius, i. 35, 117. his *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, 242—316, 330. was persecuted by Constantius the emperor, 367, 421, 540, 541, 542, 616. ii. 636.  
 Athenæus, ii. 74.  
 Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, i. 257.  
 Attiniacum, or Acciniacum, a synod there, i. 476.  
 Audientes, who were so called, i. 23.  
 Augustin, i. 48, 49, 62, 63, 64, 70, 83, 85. comments on St. Cyprian, 90, 91—99, 101, 115, 140, 141, 144—146. his testimonies on baptism, 151, —191. wrote against the Manichees, Arians, Donatists, and Pelagians, 151. his full evidence for the antiquity of infant-baptism, 162. he had no notion of transubstantiation, 172. his sentiments on regeneration, 173, &c. on original sin, 163, 176, 177. on the origin of the soul, 176—195, 199, 210. somewhere states *fourteen* as the usual age of receiving baptism, 212. his account of Dinocrates, *ibid.* 218. quotes Pelagius, 221. his writings against the Pelagians, 223, &c. 232, 236, &c. to 290, 292, 293. never found a Christian who did not own that infants were baptized for pardon of sin, 238, 403. was learned in church history, 238. his opinion on the 'swearing' of the gospel, 249. was not very conversant in the Greek language, 258. respected Pelagius highly, except for his heterodox opinions, 268. doubts of his meaning in a certain passage, 278. he defends Zosimus against the Pelagians, who claimed him as their friend, 286. his letters against Julian, bishop of Eclanum, 292. his opinion on particular predestination, 258, 297. his

books against Vincentius Victor, 299. his account of the Pelagians' ground for infant-baptism, 315, 316. quoted by Walafrid Strabo, 340. cited, 353. at what age he was baptized, 403. some account of his parents, *ibid.*, &c. he becomes a Manichee, 406. a sceptic, *ibid.* at length a Christian, *ibid.* cited, 412, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 435, 436. attacked by M. Le Clerc, 438—443. his explication of the text John iii. 5, 447, 449, 450, 453, 454. his opinion of infants dying unbaptized, 455—459, 462, 463, 470, 471, 472, 474, 540, 547. 603, 627, 628, 629, 632, 633, 634, 640. ii. 16, 29, 262, 263, 316, 321, 337, 346, 349, 361, 363, 367, 370, 376, 377, 385, 397, 409, 465, 499, 535, 542, 551, 557, 602, 608, 612, 615, 616, 627, 629, 636, 640, 641, 646, 658, 663, 665, 666, 667.

Aurelius Victor, i. 375.

Auxentius, an Arian, bishop of Milan, i. 370, 374, 392, 414, 526.

Auxilius, i. 474.

#### B.

Babylonians, their customs, ii. 433, 435.

Bagshaw, a writer quoted by Mr. Baxter, i. 413. ii. 475.

Balsamon, a Greek canonist, i. 97. his gloss on Photius, 98, 353. ii. 27, 28, 29, 361, 407, 408, 658, 663.

Baluzius, an editor of the Councils, i. 93.

Bampfield, Francis, his book on the sabbath, i. 553, and note.

Bangorian controversy, short remark on its rise and progress, ii. 542, note.

Baptism, our Saviour's law concerning it, i. 2. the author's design concerning it, 3. baptism of Jewish proselytes differed from their other baptisms, 6. the mode adopted by St. John not minutely set down, 17. baptism of Jewish proselytes called their *new birth*, 19. the foolish fancy of the Talmudical doctors on this, 20. a parallel instituted between Jewish and Christian baptism, 21. Justin Martyr considers it to be instead of circumcision, 40. called by the ancients περιτομή ἀχειροποίητος, 41. denoted by the early Christians by the words ἀνακαινισμός, καινοποιΐα, φωτισμός, 43. called by Irenæus λύτρωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις, 44. was used by heathens as a religious rite, 63. baptizing a woman with child, 64, &c. was sometimes delayed by

half-Christians, 132. the baptisms of Moses, John, and Christ contrasted by St. Basil, 134. private baptism, in houses, unknown in St. Austin's time, 188. conditional, used by the church of England, 199. the set times for it anciently were Easter and Pentecost, 203, 205. reasons for that custom, 206. strange modes adopted by the early sectaries, 308—315. private baptism disliked by Cartwright and others, 445. the *baptisms* or *washings* of the Jews, 537, 538. 'baptism of blood,' what it is, 449. persons dying without it, 444, 449, 450. delaying it till too late, 451, &c. prevented by sudden death, 452. the opinions of the ancients as to infants dying unbaptized, 454, 455. 'baptism of fire,' what it is, 487. opinions concerning the state of persons dying unbaptized, both infants and adults, 443—474. lay-baptism allowed by the Lutherans, 469. the Calvinists' opinion of the value of baptism, *ibid.* John Frith's 'Declaration' of it, 522. the convocation, A.D. 1536, sets forth articles concerning it, 523. the convocation, A.D. 1662, adds an office for adult baptism, 532. the chief rites of it, in various countries 570, &c. at first was by *immersion* *ibid.* in rivers or ponds, 571. in *baptisteries*, *ibid.* the English offices for, 579. who baptize *naked*, 591. what, in Mr. Gale's opinion, is true Christian baptism, ii. 52. what is essential to it, *ibid.* 52—54. was administered in England by *dipping*, till queen Elizabeth's time, 100. baptism of adults plainly spoken of in scripture, 145. but that of infants not only not mentioned, but positively disallowed, 161. teaching must necessarily precede baptism, 161, 162—207. baptism called σφραγίς τῆς πίστεως, *sigillum fidei*, 177. no initiatory baptism among the Jews spoken of in scripture, 234—237. nor in any other authentic ancient history, 237, 307. Dr. Wall's answer to these assertions, 508, &c. 514, &c. 517, &c. his censure of Mr. Gale's definition of true baptism, 419. metaphorical uses of the word *baptism*, 587.

Baptize, must signify *to dip* (according to Mr. Gale), ii. 641.

'Baptized for the dead,' its meaning, i. 33, 313, 314, 624.

Βαπτίζω, its sense in scripture, i. 536—539. always signifies *to dip*, ii. 58,

- &c. synonymous with the word βάπτω, 60, 141, 425. ancient authorities cited, 61, &c. critics, 86, &c. the scriptures of the Old Testament, 89, &c. the Oriental versions, 109, 118. the Greek, 109. the New Testament, 117, &c. Dr. Wall's remarks on these points, and answers to them, 423, &c.
- Baptisteries, i. 571.
- Βαπτιστήριον, ii. 458.
- Barker, Rev. Dr., i. 565.
- Barlow, Dr. Thomas, bishop of Lincoln, i. 61. he is quoted as a friend by the antipædobaptists, 348. his letter to Tombes, *ibid.* this was printed against his will, 349. his explanation of it to Mr. Wills, *ibid.* ii. 19, 662.
- Barnabas, St., his Epistle, i. 526. ii. 124, 239, 256, 315, 341, 517, 525, 590, 658.
- Baronius, cardinal, his Annals, i. 64, 195, 196, 364, 375, 377, 380, 383, 397, 478. abuses the emperor Constantine, 368. his condemnation of Maximus, 373. his habit, *ibid.* ii. 297, 298, 299, 364, 558, 559, 566, 574.
- Barthius, Caspar, ii. 232.
- Basil, St., quoted, i. 8. his testimonies on baptism, 130—138. concerning his baptism, 101. and life, 102, &c. his treatment by the emperor Valens, 136. a passage supposed to be in favour of antipædobaptism, 334. his age uncertain, 384. Danvers asserts that he was not baptized in infancy, 377. false ground of this assertion, *ibid.* cited, 415, 421, 430, 451, 593, 595, 650. ii. 204, 234, 296, 515, 550, 626, 640.
- Basil of Ancyra, his opinions, i. 616.
- Basilides, i. 340, 574. ii. 457.
- Basiliscus, the emperor, i. 618.
- Basnage, M., his history of the church, i. 295.
- Batenburg, John, a leader of the anabaptists, i. 518.
- Batrachomyomachia, whether Homer be the author, ii. 62.
- Baxter, Richard, i. 61, 86. reproves Danvers, 162, 338. his dispute with Danvers, respecting Vincentius Victor, 304. notice of his pieces on baptism, *ibid.* (note.) is unfairly cited, 333, 334. his opinion as to the ancient practice of infant-baptism, 355. accuses Danvers, 359—409, 412. vindicates Wicliffe, 465. cited, 471—475, 477, 481, 483, 485, 495, 675. writes earnestly to dissuade his fol-
- lowers from separating from the church of England, 680. ii. 34, 35, 411, 475, 476, 487, 612, 618, 662.
- Bechai, a Jewish rabbi, cited by Selden, i. 7.
- Bede, Ven., his 'Church history,' i. 409, 411.
- Beghards, or Pyghards, i. 488, 497, 500, 515, 517. their confession, 517. what the name may mean, *ibid.*
- Begines, or Beguines, female Beghards, i. 517.
- Belgic Confession, i. 540.
- Bellarmino, Cardinal, i. 377. ii. 32.
- Βῆμα, its proper signification, i. 105.
- Benjamin, rabbi, ii. 107.
- Benson, a Jesuit in disguise, i. 564.
- Berengarians, afterwards Waldenses, i. 479, 480.
- Berengarius, archdeacon of Angers, i. 477. his opinions on the real presence, and on baptism of infants, 478, 479, 491.
- Bernard, Jacques, his review of Dr. Wall's History, ii. 363—374, 394, 538.
- Bernard, St., i. 454, 463. opposes the Waldenses, 493, 494, 503, 504. ii. 664.
- Bernardus Lutzenburgensis, i. 498.
- Beveridge, bp., ii. 124, 125, 131, 134.
- Beza, Th., i. 497. ii. 109, 178, 438, 495, 670.
- Bible translations, and how far correct, ii. 444—447, 495, 497, 498, 506, 575, 581, 582. various versions in Walton's Polyglott, 312. the Syriac version of, 93. English, the authorized version, in Mr. Gale's opinion loose, 111, 112, 120. said not to express truly the original, 168. various versions, 202. published in English, 149. opposed by the church of Rome, *ibid.* chronological notes in its margin, 567. English, 588.
- Bibliotheca Patrum, i. 477, 478. ii. 545, 627, 665.
- Biel, i. 467.
- Bilius, I., i. 103. his opinions on baptism, 349. some account of him, *ibid.* (note.) 379, 382. ii. 19, 30, 409, 410.
- Bingham, Joseph, his 'Antiquities' cited, i. 210. ii. 458, 546, 601, 670.
- Binius, an editor of the councils, i. 195.
- Births, three several ones reckoned to every Christian by ecclesiastical writers; Gregory Nazianzen, &c. i. 77.



- Blake, T., his pamphlets on sprinkling, &c., i. 581. ii. 458.
- Bleau, a printer, burns a Socinian book, i. 218.
- Blount, Jo., ii. 513.
- Bobovius, Albertus, his account of the Mahometan washings, ii. 108. some particulars of his history, *ibid.*
- Bochart, ii. 201.
- Bochellus, L., his 'Decreta Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ,' i. 191, 561, 577.
- Boëmus, Jo., cited by Danvers, i. 357. some account of him, note, *ibid.* 408.
- Bonaventure, i. 575, 576.
- Bonfinius, Ant., i. 498.
- Boni Homines of Thoulouse, i. 483. were Manichees, *ibid.*
- Boniface, bishop of Rome, corresponds with St. Austin, i. 162—170.
- Bonosus, a heretic, i. 125.
- Bossuet, M., i. 567. ii. 150, 404, 405.
- Boval, Mr., i. 520.
- Bracara, synod of, (sæc. vii.) ii. 664.
- Brachmans, the, ii. 183, 313, 588.
- Bramhall, abp., ii. 32, 410.
- Brayly, his 'Beauties of England,' ii. 506, note.
- Bread. Many churches prefer unleavened bread at the eucharist, as most agreeable with our Saviour's practice, ii. 458.
- Brerewood, Ed., i. 419, 506—509, 512, 590, 591, 637.
- Bridekirk, an ancient stone font there, i. 53, and note; 358. ii. 126.
- Brown, Rev. Edw., i. 565.
- Brown, Joseph, presented by Dr. Wall for nonconformity, ii. 56, 398, 402, 421, 476.
- Brownism, derived from the old Puritans, i. 681.
- Bruno, bishop of Angers, i. 477, 478, 479.
- Brute, John, a scholar of Wickliffe, i. 465.
- Bucer, i. 671. ii. 198.
- Bullinger, H., i. 412.
- Burigenus, a writer of the Low Countries, i. 517. and note.
- Burnet, bp., his interpretation of the text John iii. 5., i. 445, 525. his life of sir M. Hale, 529.
- Burnet on the Articles, ii. 140, 149, 158, 169, 189, 196, 263, 267, 270, 278, 328, 458, 461, 499, 528, 542, 543, 618, 659.
- Busby, Dr., his Greek Grammar, ii. 179, 500.
- Button, a zealous nonconformist, i. 563.
- Buxtorf, his 'Synagoga Judaica,' i. 22.
- his Lexicon, ii. 92, 209, 220, 225, 331, 514.
- C.
- Cæcilian, an early bishop, i. 155.
- Cæsarea, the ancient creed of, i. 612.
- Cæsarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen, i. 385. was baptized, but not in infancy, 386.
- Caicans, an ancient sect, i. 311, 417.
- Cajetan, cardinal, i. 467.
- Callimachus, ii. 77, 78.
- Calvin, J., his Psychopannuchia, &c. i. 186. his explication of 1 Cor. vii. 14, 214. of John iii. 5, 443. the mischief of it, *ibid.* his interpretation (of John iii. 5.) condemned by Hooker, 144. adopted by Cartwright, 445. by the modern antipædobaptists, *ibid.* his opinion on the sleep of the soul, 546. on sprinkling in baptism, 580. cited, 404, 469, 497, 671. ii. 305—367, 369, 370, 462, 463, 465, 468, 615.
- Calvinists, ii. 655.
- Camden, John, i. 54, 358. his history interpolated, *ibid.* 364, 365, 563. ii. 126.
- Cameron, Lud., ii. 169, 198.
- Canisius, P., i. 541.
- Canons, apostolic, i. 540, 545. ii. 124.
- Canterus, G., his version of Lycophron, ii. 78.
- Cappadocia, the church of, ii. 631.
- Cappellus, Lud., ii. 108.
- Carpocrates, i. 310. his followers' manner of baptism, 312.
- Carthage, synod of, i. 78, 85, 191. ii. 634. council of, (A. D. 412.) i. 70, 222. difficulty in fixing the precise times of the more ancient ones, 307. variation in the MSS. 191. council, (A. D. 416.) 222, 263. ii. 664. it sends an epistle to Innocent, bishop of Rome, i. 263. another council, (A. D. 417.) 290. another, (A. D. 418.) *ibid.* a canon recited, 291, 305. ii. 361. another, (A. D. 419.) i. 306, 413.
- Carthage, a great persecution at, i. 88.
- the church of, ii. 392, 393.
- Carthusians, i. 557.
- Cartwright, Tho., his controversy with Whitgift, i. 189, 470.
- Casaubon, I., ii. 86, 125, 139, 298, 431, 558, 559.
- Cassander, G., i. 142, 413, 467, 468, 501, 518. ii. 664.
- Cassianus, i. 297, 320.
- Cassiodorus, i. 417, 418. ii. 332.
- Castalio, ii. 202.
- Castellus, E., his Lexicon, ii. 92, 201, 330.



- Catabaptists, so called by Beza, ii. 670.  
 Cataphryges, Montanists, i. 315.  
 Catechism of the Church of England, i. 204, 206, 684, 685.  
 Catechumens, who were so called, i. 23, 93, 135, 136, 173.  
 Catena Patrum, ii. 622.  
 Cathari, or Puritans, i. 480, 486, 488, 494, 498, 541.  
 Cave, Dr., his 'Historia Litteraria,' i. 191, 195, 378. his account of Jo. Philoponus, 434, 587. reflects on M. Le Clerc, ii. 22.  
 Celecyth, the synod of, i. 578. ii. 138, 210, 347, 458.  
 Celsus, i. 543.  
 Celsus, a child; his history, i. 211.  
 Census, difficulties attending the fixing of that mentioned in the Gospel, ii. 569—576. rolls of it laid up as records, 576, &c.  
 Cephisodorus, ii. 194.  
 Cerdo, i. 340, 311.  
 Ceremonies, any difference in, is no just ground for separation, i. 665, 666. the church of England's declaration, 667.  
 Cerinthus, Cerinthians, i. 35, 122, 310, 313, ii. 596.  
 Cevennes, the inhabitants of, supposed to be descendants of the Waldenses, i. 485. the wars there, 491.  
 Chalcedon, the council of, i. 618, 627.  
 Chaldæans, a branch of the Muscovites, i. 149.  
 Chardin, sir John, his remarks on the Georgians and Mengrelians, i. 510, &c. account of a christening there, 511.  
 Charenton, protestant church of, ii. 417.  
 Charles I, king, ii. 485.  
 Chemnitius, M., ii. 424.  
 Χέρμιστα. The meaning of this word discussed, ii. 436, 437.  
 Chilmead, Edmund, his translation of Leo Modena, i. 5.  
 Christ, given to infants, i. 207, 208. See *Anointing*, *Chrysome*.  
 Christ, Jesus. To what place his soul went, i. 546, &c.  
 Christendom, an old expression for baptism, i. 410, 411.  
 Christening-day, ii. 464. μαθητεύειν is 'to christen,' 491.  
 Christening, modern usages as to the infant's dress, &c., ii. 644, 645. on the usual feasting and presents, 649.  
 Christians, primitive: their custom as to baptizing infants, i. 2, 590. their ancient writers speak of the Jewish baptism of proselytes, 8. had an eye to Jewish rites and ordinances, 21. this instanced in several particulars, *ibid.* in early times there were many waverers, or half-Christians, and these deferred their baptism, 132. some ancient Christians were not baptized in infancy, 361—409. Greek Christians practise infant-baptism, 505. and by *immersion*, 589. Asiatic Christians of various sects, all hold infant-baptism, 506, &c. of St. Thomas, in India, practise infant-baptism, 508. the primitive baptized by *dipping* only, ii. 122, 126, 127, 130. accused of child-murder, 10. the word *Χριστιανὸς* not used by St. Paul, i. 490.  
 Chronicon Alexandrinum, i. 36, 375.  
 Chronology, ii. 558, &c. 563—568, &c. 623.  
 Chrysome-cloth, a description of it, i. 584, and note.  
 Chrysostom, i. 36. his testimonies on baptism, 141—149. compares circumcision with it, 142. speaks of a dispute between a Christian and a Greek, 187. his interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 14., 241. cited, 258. of 1 Cor. xv. 29., 313, 314. a work ascribed to him, 331. was baptized when adult, 388. his parents not Christians at his birth, *ibid.* arguments brought forward on both sides, 388—391, 450, 451, 591, 593, 598, 603, 624, 640. undeservedly spoken of by Dr. Wall, ii. 20. quoted, 123, 372, 405, 551, 627, 636, 640.  
 Church. What constitutes a true church, ii. 38, 40, 41. the extent and bounds of the church's power, 48, 49. what is Dr. Wall's notion of a true church, 52. a new notion respecting a church of Christ lately set forth in England, 386. Church authority attacked, 651, 652. some of the objects of the attack, 653. church government, a point of the ancient discipline commended by Dr. Wall, i. 560. that of the English antipædobaptists, 558.  
 Churches of Africa, ii. 392, 393.  
 — of Alexandria, ii. 662.  
 — of Britain, in the times of Pelagius, i. 289. before the arrival of the English, 409. their conversion by Austin, *ibid.* they baptized infants, 411. ii. 665.  
 — of Cappadocia, ii. 631.  
 — of Carthage, ii. 392, 393.  
 — of Denmark, ii. 416.  
 — of England, her office of baptism, i. 171, 199, 447, 579. ii. 540, 643. suffers from schism, i. 127.

allows private baptism, in certain cases, 189. her *conditional* baptism, 199. her Catechism, 204—207, 684. a point in it examined, 685. ii. 164. her liturgy, i. 207. deems that the Fathers need not to be defended from the attacks of Socinians, 424. her interpretation of our Saviour's words at John iii. 5., 447. her ordination, ii. 413. uses *regeneration* as synonymous with *baptism*, i. 447. her opinion of the necessity of baptism, 469. of the state of infants dying unbaptized, 470. a rubric in her baptismal office objected to, 472. her moderate opinions, 505. one of the last to admit baptism by *affusion*, 575. her latest order on the subject, 583. her office of confirmation, 601. 684. ii. 389. her excellence in the matter of subscriptions, i. 664. ii. 417. her declaration as to rites and ceremonies, i. 667. ii. 417. is in communion with foreign protestant churches, though she differs from them in ceremonies, &c., i. 668. she and the dissenters ought to unite, 682. a character drawn of her, ii. 3. she is not chargeable with the strange opinions or evil deeds of individuals, 32, 33. most of the clergy called by Mr. Gale non-juring Jacobites, or high-flyers, 33, 41. he judges that those who own the church of Rome for a true church ought to join themselves to her, 38. her definition of a true church, 40. whether she ought to conform to the dissenters, 44. or to conciliate them, 48. her definition of a true church, as given in her Articles, 53, 419. a question whether she herself may be a true church, 53, 413, 636. her order of confirmation, 54, 389. she has no power over dissenters, 56, 421. her baptism not real baptism, 53, 54, 61. whether she is tolerant, 129. some rank Socinians among her adherents, *ibid.* admits infants to baptism without a personal profession of faith, 130. why does she still continue baptism by sprinkling? 139. if the wish of her clergy for restoring dipping be real, not pretended? 140. her Articles cited, to prove that the scripture is her only rule of faith, 149—151. said to have two baptisms, 291. this repudiated, 554, 645. her Catechism, 366, 595, 640, 646. her Articles, 53, 149, 151, 372, 419, 478, 585. baptizes children of infidels, but with certain engagements, 371. follows

the ancient church in applying Christ's words, John iii. 5, to baptism, *ibid.* her Articles cited, 372. her Ordination Service, 643, 644, 645. her Office of Baptism, 643, 645. her Office of Private Baptism, 648. objected to by the presbyterians, at the Savoy Conference, *ibid.*

Church, Greek, knew no antipædobaptism in the twelfth century, i. 97. believed that infants dying unbaptized would miss of heaven, but not be punished, 330, 455. still baptizes infants, 505, 509. abstains from blood and things strangled, according to the apostle's precept; in which the antipædobaptists of England join it, 545. uses *immersion*, 414, 589, 590. differs from the western in one clause of the Nicene Creed, 620. whether she now uses the Nicene or the Constantinopolitan, 621. how soon she began to give the eucharist to infants, 635, 636.

— of Muscovy, baptizes infants, i. 506.

— of Prussia, ii. 416.

— of Rome, fabricates the Decretal Epistles, i. 200. her liturgy, 207. has grown latitudinarian on the Pelagian tenets, 285. and has allowed the Jesuits to undermine the doctrine of original sin, *ibid.* anciently was zealous for the prædestinarian side, 297. her *limbus infantum*, 140, 307, 455—505. seeks to embroil protestants with each other, 352, 354, 356. a fit answer to one of her objections against us, 368. her conduct towards emperors, ancient and modern, *ibid.* is pædobaptist, 595. but recently has adopted the opposite course, to gain a point, 566. papists in disguise undermining our church, *ibid.* her custom of anointing, 599. did not rebaptize believing converts, but anointed them, 600. it cannot be known what form of creed they used in the most ancient times, 621. they received the Nicene Creed, *ibid.* but probably had a form of their own, which they used in baptism, *ibid.* Rufinus' comment on it, 622. how her creed, faith, and see, came to bear the title of *apostolic*, 672. she has often tried to *force* all men into unity, 661. whether protestants may join in her service, 670. maintains that there is no scripture-proof for infant-baptism, 674, ii. 471. an argument from thence, *ibid.* she encourages animosities and divisions,

2. an union with her thought practicable by Mr. Dodwell, 7. she *compels* persons to separate from her, 38. opposed the publication of the Bible in English, 149. vehemently assaults the Reformation, 150. argues from infant-baptism in favour of tradition, *ibid.* the consequences of arguing solely from the silence of scripture, 156, 158, &c. by what means her innovations gradually prevailed, 347, 348, 413, 421, 464, 483, 535.
- Church of Rotterdam, ii. 417.
- of Scotland, ii. 416.
- of Sweden, ii. 416.
- Cicero, quoted; ii. 14, 111. his life, 183, 192, 194, 196, 295, 447.
- Circassia, i. 505, 507, &c. their sad state of religion, 510, &c.
- Circumcellions, i. 437.
- Circumcision, Abyssinian, i. 513. baptism never so called in Scripture, ii. 286. two kinds spoken of there, *ibid.* 287.
- Clarendon, Edward earl of, his history, i. 530. called 'the English Thucydides,' ii. 35. refuses to communicate with the French protestants, 45, 417.
- Clarus, an African bishop, ii. 205.
- Claude, M., ii. 46.
- Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 33. quoted, 51—53, 316, 640. ii. 119, 175, 181, 183, 184, 202, 296, 301—303, 313, 314, 327, 332, 450, 500, 503, 569, 579, 588, 590—595, 635.
- Clement Romanus, quoted, i. 29—40. his writings formerly not thought genuine, 34. his epistles were written before the Gospel of St. John, 35, 38. the time of his death inquired into, 35. he was not the Clement mentioned by St. Paul, Philipp. iv., 39, 202. referred to, 387, 639, ii. 204, 243, 257, 315, 319, 341, 525, 588, 628.
- Clement's Constitutions, account of this and similar early forgeries, i. 324, 630. ii. 385, 395, 396. its character, 396, 403, 520, 593.
- Clericus, or Le Clerc, John, i. 62, 117, 127, 129. his history of Pelagianism and Lives of the Fathers, 217, 218, n. 268, 422. his mistakes in it, 218, 254, 273, n. 274, n. and misrepresentations, 228, 230, 232, 234, 236, 257, 258. fancies a contradiction in Gregory Nazianzen, 379, 381, 439. his ill designs, 381. false charge of tritheism, 423, &c. his 'Critical Epistles,' 423, 427. misrepresents St. Augustin, 436, 438, 439. his 'Bibliothèque choisie,' 438. is not fit to translate or expound Scripture, 439. his 'Comedy,' *ibid.* his Eulogy on Locke, 440. his censure of Stillingfleet, *ibid.* finds fault with St. Hilary, 441. cited, 619. his ill design against the Fathers, 629, ii. 20. the reason of so many enemies attacking him, 21, 22. he is accused by Dr. Cave, 22. defends himself, *ibid.* quoted, 125, 189. his edition of the New Testament, 189. his opinion of the rabbins, 224, 271, 405, 451, 489, 499, 668.
- Clerk, Samuel, ii. 201.
- Cobbett, Thomas, i. 413, and note.
- Cælestinus, Pope, i. 320.
- Cælestius, i. 64, 70, 199, 216. was an Irishman, 220. some account of him, *ibid.* 222, &c. 234. his *Syllogisms*, 243. his *Definitiones*, 249. at Constantinople, 257. his *Libellus fidei*, 267. is not the same piece as that by Pelagius, *ibid.* nor is it the same with St. Austin's *Sermo de tempore*, 273, n. his creed not extant, except in part, preserved by St. Austin, 279. it was more open and undisguised than that of Pelagius, 280. an extract given, 279. he would not easily be put down, 281. the Pelagian heresy called the *Cælestian* in the East, 282. he flattered Zosimus, yet would not be guided by him, *ibid.* maintained that his doctrines were not heretical, 287. ii. 664, 666.
- Coleman, a Jesuit in disguise, i. 563, 564.
- Cologne, the council of, i. 577.
- Colomesius, P., his 'Letters,' i. 515.
- Combefis, F., i. 377.
- Common Prayer, book of, ii. 510.
- Commons, House of, their declaration A. D. 1620, ii. 46.
- Communicating infants, ii. 337, 349, 384, 628, 629. See *Eucharist*.
- 'Communion of saints,' its meaning, i. 659.
- Communion, received daily in some ancient churches, i. 172. remissness of modern protestants in this point, *ibid.* See *Eucharist*.
- Competentes, who were so called, i. 23.
- Compton, Dr. H., bishop of London, his instructions to his clergy respecting private baptism, ii. 648.
- Computing time, some ancient modes of, ii. 558.
- Confessions of the Waldenses, i. 481, 505. of the antipædobaptists, 532,



- 539, 554, 555, 675, 686, ii. 410, 481, 482, 653.
- Confirmation, the Anabaptists disagree about its practice, i. 553, 600. the English office for it, 601, ii. 389.
- Conradus de monte puellarum, a writer, i. 517.
- Constance, council of, i. 202, 465, 467.
- Constantine the emperor, was not baptized in infancy, i. 363. his vices, 367. yet he was chosen by God for an instrument of good, 368. his baptism, ii. 136, 457, 633, 636, 668.
- Constantine, H., his Lexicon, ii. 78, 86, 178, 180, 196, 431, 500.
- Constantinople, ii. 409. council of, i. 612, 617, 618.
- Constantinopolitan Creed, i. 262, 268, 617, &c.
- Constantius Chlorus, was not a Christian, i. 364, 366. forced his subjects to become Arians, 414. was a bigoted Arian, 615.
- Constantius, son of Constantine, was not baptized in infancy, and why, i. 367. was baptized afterwards, 368. persecuted Athanasius, *ibid.*
- Constitutions of Clement, i. 324.
- of the Apostles, i. 325, ii. 13, 105, 107, 123, 204, 606.
- Cophti (Egyptian Christians), baptize infants, i. 512. and give them the eucharist, 513, 637.
- Cornelius, bishop of Rome, his Epistles, i. 202, 453, 571, 600. ii. 135—137. his history of Novatus, 456, 457.
- Cornelius Nepos, ii. 181, 192, 195.
- Cornwell, Mr., a baptist minister, i. 553.
- Costelecius, Jo. S., i. 515.
- Cotelerius, his note on *Hermas*, i. 31, n. edits the 'Constitutions of the Apostles,' 325. ii. 107.
- Council of Alexandria (A. D. 362.), i. 621.
- of Antioch (A. D. 341., i. 614. another (A. D. 378.), 621.
- of Ariminum (A. D. 359.), i. 623.
- of Arles, i. 129.
- of Carthage. Synod of, (A. D. 253.), i. 78, 85. ii. 634. (A. D. 412.), i. 70, 222. several ancient ones cited, 191—197, 199. one (A. D. 416.), 222, 263. ii. 664. another (A. D. 417.), i. 290. another (A. D. 418.), *ibid.* a canon of this council recited, 291. remarkable various reading of it in some copies, 292, 306. ii. 361. another (A. D. 419.) i. 306, 413.
- of Chalcedon (A. D. 451.), i. 618, 627.
- Council of Cologne (A. D. 1536.), i. 577.
- of Constance, i. 202, 465.
- of Constantinople (A. D. 381.), i. 612, 618, 621.
- (or synod) of Diospolis, (A. D. 415.), i. 254—256.
- of Eliberis (A. D. 305.), i. 92, 399, 599.
- or synod, an ancient one in England, i. 578. ii. 138, 210, 347, 458.
- of Ephesus (A. D. 431.), i. 257, 282, 320, 618.
- of Florence (A. D. 1439.), i. 468, 589.
- of Gerunda (A. D. 517.), i. 321. ii. 664.
- of Hippo, i. 197.
- of Ilerda (A. D. 524.), i. 321.
- of Illyricum (A. D. 367), i. 627.
- of Laodicea, i. 570, 599.
- of Lateran (A. D. 1139.), i. 496. another (A. D. 1215.), *ibid.*
- of Milevis (A. D. 416.), i. 263, 632. ii. 664.
- of Neocæsarea (A. D. 314.), i. 94, 399, 572. ii. 27, 135, 361, 394, 407, 456, 658, 663.
- of Nice, i. 156, 421, 433. ii. 386.
- of Orange (A. D. 441.), i. 599.
- of Rome (A. D. 370.), i. 621.
- of Toledo (A. D. 630.), i. 595, 600.
- of Trent, i. 11, 175, 462, 635.
- of Tribur (A. D. 895.), i. 205.
- in Trullo, i. 188, 199, 546.
- of Vienna, under Clement V, i. 518.
- Creed, the Nicene, i. 117. is disowned by the unitarians, 126, 129. Mr. Le Clerc's slander of it, 129. the most ancient creed now extant, *ibid.* 604. the clause 'the Maker of heaven and earth,' when added, and why, 311. the form of this creed, 611. some expressions in it directed against Arius, 612. the orthodox Christians maintain it against the various creeds of the Arians, 614. is used by the catholics in the East, 617, 618. approved by the council of Ephesus, *ibid.* of Chalcedon, *ibid.* by the edicts of Justinian, of Basiliscus, and Zeno, *ibid.* some additions to it made at Constantinople, 619. so that by the words 'Nicene Creed' from that time the Constantinopolitan is generally understood, *ibid.* it is received by the church of Rome, 625. is on the whole preferable to the Roman, 626.
- that of Eusebius, i. 612.



Creed of the church of Cæsarea, i. 612.  
 — of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, i. 613.  
 — the Constantinopolitan, i. 262, 269, n. 617. is merely that of Nice, with some additional clauses, 619. a copy of it, *ibid.* is used now almost universally, *ibid.* one clause added afterwards by the church of Rome, 620. its difference from the Nicene, *ibid.* baptism is named in it, 673. ii. 386.  
 — of Jerusalem, mentioned by St. Cyril, i. 617, 618.  
 — of Aquileia, i. 269, n. 623, 624.  
 — of Arius, i. 613. ii. 386.  
 — of the Arians, numerous, i. 614. often altered, 617, 623. ii. 386.  
 — of Eunomius, i. 615.  
 — the Apostles', or Roman, i. 126, 621. a copy of it, 622. Rufinus' exposition of it, 273. n. 622, 623. differences in it, *ibid.* 624. why called 'The Apostles' Creed,' 625. no foundation for the current story, *ibid.* at what period it took its present form, *ibid.* is received by the Greek church also, *ibid.*  
 Creed of Athanasius, i. 128, 623, 626. its age and character, *ibid.*  
 — that of Pelagius, i. 268, 269. is very express in reference to the Trinity, 268. note. opposes Arius and Sabellius, 270. also Photinus and Apollinaris, 271. differs from Origen and St. Jerome, 273, n. 274, n. 275, n.  
*Creeds*, a Socinian pamphlet on the subject, i. 550. all the ancient ones agreed in substance, though not in form, 604. no copy of a very ancient one remains, *ibid.* the Nicene the oldest, *ibid.* the substance of Christian profession of faith gathered from writers more ancient than any creed now extant, 605, &c. why creeds became necessary *ibid.* numerous among the Arians, 614, 623. whether the modern antipædobaptists have any settled form, 627. the ancient ones contained every article deemed fundamental, 673. baptism was named in some, *ibid.* all ancient creeds contained the article of Christ's being born of a Virgin, ii. 600. *πίστις*, a common name for the creed, 601.  
 Crellius, Jo., his book, ii. 17.  
 Cresconius, a Donatist, i. 101. ii. 663.  
 Critolaus, ii. 194.  
 Cromwell, Oliver, ii. 487.

Cross, infants were anciently signed with it, at baptism, i. 148.  
 Crossfield, John, his pamphlet on infant-baptism, ii. 380, n.  
 Crull, Dr., his 'State of Muscovy,' i. 419, n. 420, 506, 589.  
 Cudworth, Ralph, i. 423, 424, 439.  
 Curcellæus, i. 423, 424, 435, 439, 440. ii. 19.  
 Cusanus, cardinal, rejects the old Decretals, i. 201.  
 Cyprian, St., quoted, i. 8, 78—92. a various reading in the editions of his works, 87, cited, 130, 163, 421, 540, 572, 595, 598, 603, 611, 624. a false reading, 629—637, 640, 641, 687. ii. 10, 11, 12, 54, 87, 125. an advocate for sprinkling, 127, 131—133, 136, 138. a friend to the clergy, 137, 145, 234, 319, 337, 338, 346, 361, 382, 384, 392, 393, 397, 403, 454, 455, 516, 528, 551, 552, 612, 615, 628—633, 634, 635, 637—639, 658, 659, 661, 662, 667, 668. a high character of him and of his works, 633.

## D.

Dacherius, his 'Spicilegium,' i. 495.  
 Dadosius and other leaders of the Messalians, i. 418.  
 Daillé, his work 'De Usu Patrum,' i. 87. his opinions on infant-baptism, 355, 361, 363, 408, 590, 628, 632. ii. 12, 19, 125, 253, 333, 621, 661.  
 Dale, Antony van, his 'History of Baptisms,' i. 349.  
 Danetus, his lexicon, ii. 320, 603.  
 Danvers, Henry, i. 61, 67, 83. he misunderstands St. Austin, 161. accused of unfairness, 204. his dispute with Wills and Baxter respecting Vincentius Victor, 304. notice of the pieces published on both sides, *ibid.* n. cites Eusebius, 335. Jerome, 336. Hilary, 337. Joannes Boemus, 357. and several other authors, all of whom he misrepresents, 359. was publicly accused of forging quotations, *ibid.* thinks Constantine's father was a Christian, 365. quotes the centurians of Magdeburg, *ibid.* more unfair quotations, 377. cites a great many names of persons little known, 408, 409. further mistakes, 409, 418, 448, 463, 464, 465, 466, 475, 476, 486, 495. asserts that the German anabaptists only continued an ancient doctrine, 515. that anabaptists were early found in England, 522. quoted, 553, 566, 585. his most unfair quotations condemned, *ibid.* 586, ii. 401, 408, 474, 475, 478, 480, 487, 530;

538, 553, 554, 612, 634, 640, 658, 662, 663, 665.  
 Dauphiné, some of the Waldenses there, i. 492, 495, 502.  
 Davye, Mr. Thomas, of Leicester, his book against infant-baptism, i. 413. a review of it, ii. 657—667, 674, 675.  
 Dean, captain, i. 530.  
 Decretals of Clement V., i. 190. of Siricius, 200, &c. general history of them, ibid. 205, 332. ii. 15, 675.  
 Deists, i. 487.  
 Delaune, Thomas, his 'Plea for Non-conformists,' i. 408. and n.  
 Delphos, the Oracle at, ii. 235.  
 Democritus, ii. 183.  
 Demosthenes, ii. 173.  
 Dempster, Thomas, mistakes in his 'History of Scotland,' i. 220 and n.  
 Denmark, the church of, i. 667. ii. 45.  
 Denne, John, i. 408.  
 Deodwinus, bishop of Liege, i. 478, 479.  
 Dervises, i. 558.  
 Dew, very abundant in the East, and in hot climates, ii. 92, 426, 434.  
 Didymus, his Scholia on Homer, i. 540. ii. 65, 94, 392.  
 Didymus (Pseudo), 74, 80.  
 Dimmock, Roger, i. 522, 523.  
 Dinocrates, a boy, i. 212, whose case is discussed between Vincentius Victor and St. Austin, 302, &c.  
 Diodati, ii. 202.  
 Diodorus, a philosopher, ii. 194.  
 Diodotus, a Stoic, ii. 192, 295.  
 Diogenes Laertius, ii. 182, 193, 295.  
 Dion, of Syracuse, ii. 182, 195.  
 Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, i. 335. ii. 319, 338, 630, 631, 641.  
 Dionysius the Areopagite, his works supposititious, i. 326. opinions of baptism given in them, ibid. 641.  
 Dionysius Halicarnassensis, ii. 79, 193, 194, 282, 283, 547.  
 Dionysius, bishop of Rome, ii. 338.  
 Dionysius, of Syracuse, ii. 182.  
 Diospolis, (or Lydda,) the synod of, i. 235, 254, 281.  
 Dipping. Dipping three times in baptism used by the Jews, i. 23. dipping of children first left off in France, 480, 576. whether *baptizing* in Scripture is always to be understood of *dipping*, 536. it was the ancient practice, 570. defended, ibid. in cases of sickness, &c. affusion was used, even in ancient times, 571, 574. both were occasionally used in the ancient French church, ibid. 575. dipping the custom in England, 575, 576. its progress in France, 576. in

England, 577, &c. left off in the reign of queen Elizabeth, 580. first by people of high rank, ibid. Calvin's influence on the point, ibid. Dr. Wall knew some few who had been dipped, and himself had dipped one infant, 581. Mr. Blake's pamphlets on it, ibid. it is still used in countries not subject to the pope, 583, 589. the present order of the church of England on the point, ibid. endeavours to restore the use of it, 584, 586, 587. it is still used in the Greek church, 589. and by many other Christians, ibid. 590. the only true way of baptizing, ii. 52. Dr. Wall said to admit this, 53. allowed to agree with the commands of Scripture, 59. βαπτίζω always signifies to *dip*, 58, &c. βάπτω the same: with allusion to the art of *dyeing*, 68. authorities for this signification, from classic writers, 61—85. from critics, 86, &c. from the Old Testament, 89, &c. from the Oriental versions, 109, 118. from the Greek, 109. from the New Testament, 117, &c. St. John baptized by dipping, 121. the primitive Christians did the same, 122. authorities from the Fathers, 123, &c. from modern authors, 124, &c. from several modern versions as quoted by bishop Nicholson, 125. whether *aspersion* was used till one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles? 134. and even then it was only admitted as an alternative in peculiar cases, 135, &c. 138. how it came into use in England, 210. how suddenly laid aside, 337, 347. Dr. Wall's reply to Mr. Gale's remarks on the point of dipping, 422, &c. it was the primitive mode of baptizing; and most learned men own it for the more fitting way, 451—454. all churches used it except those of Rome and Geneva, 454. why no very early authorities are cited for sprinkling, 455. the English clergy defended in their practice, from Mr. Gale's remarks, 460. and the order of our church on the point vindicated, ibid. Dr. Wall's fuller thoughts and suggestions on the practice, 461, &c. and 641, &c.  
 Directory, the Presbyterian, i. 190, n. ii. 428. it orders baptizing in a basin, i. 582, 583.  
 Disciple, its true meaning, i. 651, &c., ii. 192. farther discussion of its meaning, 488, &c.

- Dissenters. Whether they ought to join the church of England, or she ought to go over to them, ii. 43, 44, 46, 51. are obliged in conscience to separate themselves, 49. protected in the exercise of their religion, 128. a loose political body of them in England induced the presbyterians and others to separate from the church of England, 651, 652.
- Diverse, its meaning, ii. 446.
- Dodwell, Henry, i. 36, 49, 50. his opinion of the Jewish rabbis, ii. 224. cited, 298, 304, 305, 321, 324, 558, 559, 566. a reproof of him by Mr. Gale, 7, n. 41. quoted, 32, 33.
- Donatists, i. 64. their schism, 155. St. Austin writes against them, *ibid.* 253. their tenets, 157, 161, 193, 194, 199. the sect declines, 192, 194, 289. rebaptize catholics, 374. their controversy with Optatus, 100. their opinions on baptism, 411. did not reject infant-baptism, 413, 436. accounted schismatics, 669. ii. 420, 482, 658, 661, 662, 663.
- Dorrington, Rev. Theoph., his work on baptism censured by Mr. Gale, ii. 167. vindicated, 486, 487.
- Dort, the synod of, i. 231, 522.
- Driedo, Jo., i. 461. ii. 263.
- Druids, the, ii. 183.
- Drusius, Jo., quoted, i. 5. ii. 108.
- Dryden, Jo., his Virgil quoted, ii. 62.
- Dugranica, a country so called, i. 489.
- Dulcinus Navarrensensis, i. 496.
- Du Pin, his edition of Optatus, i. 101, n. his opinion of the Decretals, 205. of the canon of the council of Carthage (A. D. 418.), 306, 377, 384, 391, 646. ii. 224, 305, 333, 334, 335, 347, 514, 621, 624.
- Durandus, bishop of Liege, i. 478.
- Dutch anabaptists in London, i. 527.
- Dutch Martyrology. See *Martyrology*.
- Dutch Minnists. See *Minnists*.
- Dutch torture the English at Amboyna, i. 594.
- E.
- Easter, the principal season of baptism among the Jews, i. 22, 58, 59. one of the two also among early Christians, 203—206, 216.
- Ebion, i. 122. the first Socinian, *ibid.*
- Ebionites, i. 46, 124, 310. ii. 600.
- Eckbertus Schonaugiensis, i. 486, 495.
- Eclipses, the exact time of our Saviour's birth pointed out by them, ii. 580.
- Edessa, records of the church of, i. 622, 623.
- Edomites, conditions imposed on them by Hyrcanus, ii. 510.
- Edwards, Dr. Jo., his book on the Canticles quoted, ii. 132, 499.
- Egypt, chrism used in, i. 600.
- Eleutherus, bp. of Rome, his time, i. 50.
- Elias, the rabbins' idea of his power, ii. 250.
- Elias Cretensis, i. 386, 429.
- Eliberis, council of (A. D. 305.), i. 92, 399, 599.
- Eliezer, rabbi, quoted, i. 25. ii. 218, 221, 248, 249, 524.
- Emlyn, Thomas, his pamphlet in reply to Dr. Wall, ii. 374. (a review of it, 374—386.) 473, 511, 522, 530, 538.
- Encratites, i. 311.
- Enoch, his spiritual circumcision, ii. 284, 548.
- Epaminondas, ii. 182, 192.
- Ephesus, council of (A. D. 431.), i. 257, 282, 320, 618.
- Ephraem Syrus, i. 137. a life of St. Basil ascribed to him, 378.
- Epicurus, his doctrine, ii. 296.
- Epiphanius, i. 39, 68, 124, 312, 313, 315, 317, 318, 417, 419, 617, 624. ii. 13, 156, 204, 570, 582.
- Episcopus, i. 125, 197, 489.
- Erasmus Tusca, i. 408.
- Erasmus, his opinion of some works attributed to Origen, i. 67. his edition of Origen, 74. of St. Ambrose, 215. his conjecture about St. Jerome, 395, 397, 442, 458, 459. his Colloquies, 576. ii. 199, 202, 622.
- Erbrardus, i. 495.
- Ermingardus, i. 495.
- Establishment, what privileges an established church is entitled to, ii. 45, 415.
- Estius, i. 585.
- Evagrius, i. 627.
- Eucharist, anciently given to infants, i. 87, 92. in some ancient churches was received every day, 172. given speedily to baptized persons, both adults and infants, 628. Daillé's remarks, *ibid.* the Fathers quoted for the practice, 629. origin of it, 633. alteration made in it, 634. taken away by the council of Trent, 635. how soon it prevailed in the Greek church, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's opinion on the matter, *ibid.* the modern mode of giving it, 636. argument drawn from this custom by antipædo-baptists, 636—638. it is still used by many Christian nations, *ibid.* is not so ancient as infant-baptism, 637, 644. many persons delay their coming to receive it, 650.

- Eudoxius, an Arian bishop, i. 369.  
 Everard, Robert, his pamphlet, i. 565.  
 Evervinus of Cologne, i. 490.  
 Eugenius, a Greek usurper, i. 372. is slain, 373, 393.  
 Eunomians, St. Basil writes against them, i. 335, 435, ii. 385. one sect of them baptized in the name of the Father only, i. 540. mode of baptism, 593. their creed, 615, 618, ii. 181.  
 Euripides, quoted, ii. 65. his Scholiast, 79.  
 Eusebius, the historian, i. 34, 38, 39, 50, 78, 312, 316. cited by Danvers, 335. his account of Constantine's baptism, 363, 365, 366, 437, 453, 548, 574. his creed, 612. quoted, 616, 622, 654, ii. 23, 135, 203, 228, 246, 254, 300, 302, 334, 386, 456, 457, 493, 503, 510, 582, 588, 623, 626, 631, 636.  
 Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, ii. 136.  
 Eustathius, a Greek bishop, i. 433. his Comment on Homer, ii. 65, 436.  
 Eutyches, i. 626.  
 Eutychianism, i. 505, 506.  
 Eutychians, i. 271, n.  
 Euzoius an Arian bishop of Antioch, i. 367.  
 Exorcising, the original use of it, the later abuse, i. 604.  
 Ezechias, rabbi, ii. 223.  
 F.  
 Fabian, Jo., his 'Chronicles,' various readings in different editions, i. 409, 410. ii. 665.  
 Fabius, bishop of Antioch, i. 571.  
 Fabri, Joannes, i. 590.  
 Facundus, his opinion of pope Zosimus, i. 287.  
 Falkland, lord, ii. 35.  
 Fasting, usual before baptism, i. 570.  
 Fathers, the ancient, slanders on them, i. 421—442. their real excellence, 438.  
 Fathers, the primitive, Mr. Gale thinks they loosely expound and misapply scripture, ii. 133.  
 — the early, the credit due to them, ii. 253, 524. their statements on the point of infant-baptism, ii. 254, &c. Fathers of the second century, 280, &c. 315.  
 — the earliest, say little about infant baptism, and why, ii. 634, 639. concerning those of the next age, 638—641.  
 Fausta, wife of Constantine, not a Christian, i. 367.  
 Faustus Rhegiensis, i. 321.  
 Faydit, l'abbé, his book against Le Clerc, i. 439 and n.  
 Featley, D., i. 528, ii. 6, 35, 189, 401.  
 Fell, John, bishop of Oxford, his edition of 'Passio S. Perpetuæ,' &c., i. 303, n. some notice of his small pieces published almost annually at Oxford, *ibid.* his judgment of Rigaltius, 344, 452. ii. 19, 125, 135, 326, 614.  
 Ferrandus, Fulgentius, i. 321. his letter concerning a negro slave, 322.  
 Ferrarius, Jo., his lexicon, ii. 180.  
 Feuardentius, an editor, ii. 320, 558, 599.  
 Ficinus, his translation of Plato, ii. 295.  
*Fidelis*, the difference between it and *Catechumenus*, i. 93, 173, 237. the term never given but to a baptized person, 374. a baptized person, 404.  
 Fidus, an African bishop, i. 79, 86, ii. 337, 552.  
 Field, Dr., his book 'of the church,' i. 351, 408, 461.  
 Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, i. 452. bishop of Cappadocia, ii. 631, 655.  
 Firmin, Thomas, an English unitarian, his life, i. 118.  
 Fisher, the Jesuit, i. 567.  
 Florence, the council of, i. 468, 589.  
 Florentius Christianus, his note on Aristophanes, ii. 78.  
 Floyer, sir John, his book on bathing, i. 588. ii. 126.  
 Font, ancient one at Bridekirk in Cumberland, i. 53. ii. 126.  
 Fonts in our churches exchanged for basons, i. 582.  
 Foxe, John, his 'Martyrology,' i. 411, 466, 496, 498, 522, 524, 527. ii. 464.  
 'Foxes and Firebrands,' a book so called, i. 558, 563.  
 France, the clergy of, opposed prædestinarian opinions in the fifth century, i. 297.  
 — Louis XIV., the king of, forces his subjects to become papists, i. 414, 440.  
 — full of Albigenses, i. 484. the French king drives away the Waldenses, 485.  
 — persecution of the protestants there, i. 661. ii. 6, 57. their kind reception in England, 57, 401.  
 — first left off dipping. First anti-pædobaptists arose there, i. 480. ii. 464.  
 Frank, Sebastian, an author frequently cited by Danvers, i. 359, 412, 418, 515.



- Frith, John, i. 549, 550, 579, 633.  
 Fulgentius, i. 297, 321, 449, 459, 460, 472. ii. 263, 663.  
 Fuller, his 'Church History,' i. 365, 412, 523, 524, 527, 528.  
 Fundamentals, what are fundamental points, in Mr. Gale's judgment, ii. 39—47, 51. what in that of Dr. Wall, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 481, 636, 654, 660.
- G.
- Gagnæus, an editor of Tertullian, i. 61, ii. 326, 613.  
 Gale, John, memoir of him, Advertisement, i. page, xiii. &c., 49. he writes merely until a more full answer to Dr. Wall shall appear, ii. 9. feels compelled to tax Dr. Wall, 15. is no Socinian, nor Tritheist, 17. denies that there are any Socinians among the antipædobaptists, 30. or that the perverse opinions of a few are justly chargeable on the body, 33. examines Dr. Wall's Dissuasive from Schism, 37—57. the controversy consists of two parts; one, about the *mode* of baptizing; the other, about the *objects*, whether *infants* or *adults*, 59. he argues that βαπτίζω always signifies *to dip*, 58, &c., 141. the second branch of the dispute entered on, 142, 377, 384, 387, 388, 390, 391, 392, 395. his 'Reflections' examined and answered by Dr. Wall, 396, to the end of the volume.  
 Gale, Dr. Thomas, his 'Opuscula Mythologica,' ii. 79, 83.  
 Galenus, a Dutch Minnist, chief of the Galenists, i. 521.  
 Gamaliel, his observation, ii. 573.  
 Ganz, rabbi D., ii. 210, 218, 238.  
 Garnier, John, a Jesuit, i. 71. mistakes a passage of St. Jerome, 220. mentions twenty-four synods holden against the Pelagians, 282. cited, 286, 306. his opinion on infant-baptism, 356. his design in it, *ibid.* his oversight, 357.  
 Gascoigne, some of the Waldenses from thence, i. 492, 495, 503.  
 Gataker, T., his edition of M. Antoninus, ii. 83, 495.  
 Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, i. 210.  
 Gaufridus, his 'Life of St. Bernard,' i. 504.  
 Geddes, Mich., i. 508.  
 Geles, John, a German anabaptist, i. 518, 525.  
 Gemara, the Jewish, quoted, i. 5, 7, 10, 11, 19, 25, ii. 210, 516.  
 Gematria, a cabalistic art, ii. 223.  
 Geneva, the church of, i. 666. ii. 462, 463.  
 Gennadius, i. 172, 212, 321, 541, 542, 574, 576. his list of the writings of Pelagius, i. 268.  
 George, patriarch of Alexandria, i. 388.  
 Georgia, i. 505, 507.  
 Georgian Christians, i. 352. how first converted, 508. still adhere to the Greek church, though imperfectly, 509. sometimes delay baptism, not from principle but neglect, 510.  
 Georgirenes, Joseph, his history of Samos, i. 589, and n.  
 Gerhardus, a leader of the Gascon Waldenses, i. 496.  
 German antipædobaptists, i. 644.  
 Gerson, John, i. 467.  
 Gerunda, the council of, i. 321. ii. 664.  
 Ghebers, the Quakers resemble them, i. 557.  
 Gisburnensis Historia, cited by Jo. Foxe, i. 496.  
 Gnostics, i. 51, 311, 540. ii. 598.  
 Godfathers, or sponsors, i. 603, 628.  
 Godwin Sands, the vulgar story of their origin, i. 506, and n.  
 Godwyn, Morgan, author of a book called 'the Negro's Advocate,' i. 323, n.  
 Godwyn's 'Moses and Aaron,' i. 3, 5. ii. 660.  
 Gorgias, the orator, ii. 194.  
 Gorgonia, sister of Gregory Nazianzen, i. 385. her baptism and death, 386.  
 Gospel of the Nazarenes, a book cited by St. Jerome, i. 276, n.  
 Grabe, Dr., his various reading of a passage in Irenæus, i. 47, 50, n. cited, i. 618. ii. 181, 305, 316, 317, 581, 596—599, 622.  
 Grævius, Theodorus, his edition of Callimachus, ii. 78.  
 Gratian, the emperor, account of him, i. 370. is slain, *ibid.* it is probable that he had been baptized, 374. ii. 266.  
 Greek church, knew not antipædobaptism in the twelfth century, i. 97. the Pelagians endeavour to make a party in it, 257. Grotius' mistake as to its practice, 352. they baptize infants, 505. receive the Roman (or Apostles,) Creed, but baptize by the Nicene, 626. practise dipping, ii. 76, 370. has never had any disputes about infant-baptism, 464. some members of it held that unbaptized and heathen infants shall have little punishment or suffering, 535. it gives the eucharist to children, 629.  
 Gregorius Ariminensis, i. 461, 462.  
 Gregorius Presbyter, his life of Gregory Nazianzen, i. 379, 380, 381, 384.

- Gregory, the father of Gregory Nazianzen, some account of him, i. 378—387, and of his children, 385. is a singular instance of a man purposely deferring baptism, 386, 643, 646, 674. ii. 19, 363, 394, 405, 406.
- Gregory Nazianzen, i. 8, 48, 77. quoted, 101—130. calls baptism our 'diurnal generation,' 103. his account of St. Basil, *ibid.* 377, 384, 385. concerning his own baptism, 105, 363. he strongly urges the baptism of infants, 106, &c. combats the common excuses for delay, 110. a summary of his tenets on baptism, 113—130, 140. misquoted by Grotius, 353. quoted, 335. was not baptized in infancy, 378. some account of his father, 379, 380, 382, 384, 385. whether he was born before his father's conversion, 380—386. a singular opinion of his, 384. resigns his bishopric, 387. called a *tritheist* by M. Le Clerc, 427, 439, his real tenets, 428, &c.—450, 451, 454, 456, 475, ii. 19, 24, 25, 26, 233, 239, 263, 340, 362, 363—365, 394, 395, 405, 406, 407, 481, 515, 517, 551, 586, 589, 602, 615, 626, 646.
- Gregory Nyssen, his life of St. Basil, i. 377, 435, 451, 453, ii. 636, 640.
- Gregory, pope, the Great, i. 199, 460, 462, 575, 594, 600, 634.
- Gregory Thaumaturgus, i. 430, ii. 119, 124, 450.
- Greter, J., his writings against the Waldenses, i. 483, n. 498, 517.
- Grotius, i. 85, 94, 97, 99. his mistakes, 85, 112, 155, 171, 292, 350, n. his opinion as to the ancient practice of infant-baptism, 351. his design vindicated, 352. but he is in error, *ibid.* 360. his mistake about Chrysostom, 389—409. cited, 459, 567. ii. 20, 24. defended against Dr. Wall, 25—87, 107, 109, 110, 123, 169, 199, 271, 310, 313, 326, 333, 361, 363, 385, 394, 395, 405—408, 431, 443, 444.
- Grunnius, a name given to Rufinus by St. Jerome, i. 70.
- Grynæus, an editor of Origen, i. 74.
- Guttmund, i. 479. his opinions, *ibid.*
- Gundulphus, his sect, i. 495. ii. 399.
- H.
- Hades, Christ's descent to, i. 47. its true meaning in the Bible, 546, &c.
- Hale, judge, his behaviour to antipædobaptists, i. 529.
- Hall, bp., his 'Honour of the married Clergy,' i. 383.
- Hall, Mrs., excommunicated, ii. 56398, 402, 421, 476.
- Halley, captain, his experiments on dew, ii. 93.
- Hallingham, a Jesuit in disguise, i. 563, 564.
- Hammond, Dr. H., i. 2, 9, 11, 12, 24, 27, 87, 114, 115, 258, 329. his judgment of bp. Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying,' 346. and answers to it, 346—348. cited, 675. ii. 104, 106, 108, 110, 123, 168, 187, 188, 196, 215, 232, 267, 271, 497, 502. editions of his 'Paraphrase,' 503. variations in them accounted for, *ibid.* 503, 541, 546, 662, 670.
- Harding, John, i. 527.
- Harpocration, his lexicon, ii. 74.
- Heathen temples overthrown, A. D. 399, i. 195.
- Hegesippus, ii. 107, 228, 254.
- Helena, the mother of Constantine, some account of her, i. 366. became a Christian late in life, 367.
- Hell, its meaning in our Bible, i. 546, &c.
- Hemerobaptistæ, an ancient sect, ii. 107, 228, 435, 474.
- Henricians, i. 499, 504.
- Henry, of Lyons, i. 485, 491, 492, 494. is banished, 493. his history, 501, &c.
- Heracleon, ii. 242, 518—520.
- Heraclides Ponticus, ii. 76, 195.
- Herbert, lord, his History of Henry VIIIth, i. 525.
- Hereford, register of the church of, i. 465.
- Heresies, or sects, lists of the earliest ones, by Irenæus, i. 309. by Epiphanius, 317, 318. by Philastrius, *ibid.* by Theodoret, *ibid.* by Tertullian, 319.
- Heretics, how received into the church in ancient times, i. 421.
- Herman, archbishop of Cologne, i. 577.
- Hermas, quoted, i. 29—39. his work formerly not thought genuine, 34. it was written before St. John's Gospel, *ibid.* he is not the person mentioned by St. Paul at Romans xvi. 39. cited, 446, 451. Dr. Wall's arguments from him examined, ii. 259—262. and 271—540, 541, 275, 278, 341, 526, 528, 539.
- Hermians, or Seleucians, an ancient sect, i. 419.
- Hermolatus, quoted, ii. 78.
- Herodotus, quoted, ii. 76, 235.
- Hervetus, G., an editor of Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 53.
- Hesychius, his lexicon, ii. 67.

- Hethe, a Jesuit disguised as a Puritan, i. 564.
- Heylin, P., his 'Animadversions on Fuller's Church History,' i. 365. his 'History of Presbytery,' 563. his works, 506, n. 507, 509, 512, 526, 637.
- Hezekiah, a Jewish rabbi, quoted, i. 13.
- Hicks, Mr., his account of the anabaptists, i. 533. vindicated, *ibid.* 534.
- Hicks, Mr., his story, ii. 5, 31, 400, 401, 480.
- Hieracites, a sect described by Epi-phanus, i. 317.
- Hilary, complains of the emperor Constantius, i. 367. cited by Danvers, 337, 440, 441, 442. consults St. Austin, 154. on some doctrines of Cælestius, 243, 254, 320.
- Hilary, the deacon, his 'Commentaries,' i. 455, 473.
- Hill, Mr., his work 'De Presbyteratu,' ii. 243, 520.
- Hillel, rabbi, ii. 496.
- Hincmarus, abp. of Rheims, i. 205. his opinion concerning infants dying unbaptized, 462, 476, 477.
- Hincmarus, bishop of Laudun, i. 462. his violent conduct, 476. ii. 665.
- Hippo, a council at, i. 197.
- Hippocrates, ii. 320.
- Hoadly, bp., ii. 360, n. his latitudinarian doctrine, 650. the Bangorian controversy, 542, n.
- Hobmeier, Baltazar, a German anabaptist, i. 513.
- Holiness, whether it can mean *legitimacy*, ii. 329.
- Holinshead, R., his 'Chronicles,' i. 496.
- Holland, mode of baptism there, ii. 371. mode of receiving the Lord's Supper, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's remarks on the Minnists, &c., 372. and on the Hollanders generally, *ibid.* 386, 401, 408, 410, 415, 421, 450, 464. toleration in the states of Holland, 5, 401.
- Holland, Dr., interpolated Camden's Britannia, i. 358.
- Holland, rev. Mr., i. 53.
- Holy, meaning 'baptized,' ii. 614, 615, 616, 618, 619, 669, 670.
- Homer, quoted, ii. 62, 64, 74, 79, 80, 114, 430.
- Homilies, English, i. 549.
- Hooker, Richard, i. 444. ii. 536.
- Hooper, bp. George, his 'Discourse of Lent,' i. 3, 23.
- Hooper, bp. John, a letter by him, i. 526.
- Horace, quoted, ii. 64, 398.
- Horsleydown, a place of resort of the anabaptists, ii. 459.
- Hortentius, i. 525.
- Hoveden, Roger, i. 483.
- Huetius, his edition of Origen, i. 67, 542. ii. 333, 617, 621—623, 625, 626.
- Hugo de S. Victore, i. 463, 634.
- Huss, John, i. 467.
- Hussites, their opinion of unbaptized infants, i. 466.
- Hyde, Dr., ii. 211.
- Hyginus, bishop of Rome, cited by Platina, i. 331.
- Hyperides, a scholar of Isocrates, ii. 173. of Plato, 194.
- Hypsistarians, a religious sect, i. 379.
- Hyrcanus, John, ii. 237, 510.

## I.

- Ἰδιος, its meaning strictly defined, i. 95, 96.
- Ignatius, i. 316. ii. 174, 175, 504, 544, 658.
- Ilerda, the council of, i. 321.
- Illyricum, the council of, i. 621.
- Immersion, (baptismal,) a conjecture that it was the ancient method used in England, i. 523. considered absolutely an *essential* by the English antipædobaptists, 535. was the usual mode in the primitive church, 571. is used by the Greek church, 589, 590. ii. 138. Dr. Wall much in favour of it, 88.
- Immersion, *trine*, used by the Jews, and from them by the primitive Christians, i. 23, 24, 601. ordered by the first Common Prayer Book of Edward VI., 579. was the general practice in ancient times, 592. doubts about its necessity, 594. the Roman catholics prefer it, 595. spoken of by bishop Fell, ii. 125. See *Dipping*.
- Imposition of hands, used by the Jews on solemn occasions, i. 22.
- or Confirmation, i. 600. the English office for it, 601.
- Independents, ii. 651, 652, 658.
- Indians, conversion of, i. 335.
- Indian Christians, i. 508.
- Infants. The word sometimes refers to *age*, sometimes to the profession of Christianity, i. 72, 73, 210, 212. what it may fairly mean, ii. 319, 387—390, 395. who are really meant by it, 602. especially by Irenæus, 603, 607. the eucharist anciently given to them, i. 87, 92. dying unbaptized were supposed by many writers of the Greek church to go to some middle place, 140. acknowledged to have *original sin*, 147. used to be marked with the sign of

- the cross, 148. dying before actual sin after their baptism were supposed to be undoubtedly saved, 171, 471. chrism given to them, 208. the Pelagians' opinion of infants dying unbaptized, 263. that of Vincentius Victor, 300, &c. other opinions, 454.
- Infant-baptism, first expressly mentioned by Irenæus, i. 45, 49. allowed by the Pelagians, 83. was acknowledged in the synod of Carthage (A.D. 253.), 79, 85, 86. owned by Cælestius, 289. it was practised by all the ancient sectaries, who owned any baptism at all, 308. some few learned men among the moderns do not allow its full antiquity, 339. no *certain* evidence of any who denied it, till about the year 1522, 497. the modern Jesuits assert that it cannot be proved from scripture, 566. a summing up of the evidence in its favour, 639. of that which is or *seems* to be against it, 644. why there is so little mention of it in the more ancient Fathers, 648. why St. Luke in the *Acts* does not name it, 649. the particular *age* of receiving baptism is not a fundamental point, 672. persons ought not to break communion for it, 677—679. but Mr. Gale asserts it to be a fundamental, ii. 51. according to Mr. Gale, Dr. Wall allows it cannot be proved from scripture, 143, 145, 146. the value of this admission, 145, 147. the argument of the Romanists from thence, 150, 151. the fair consequence of the scripture's silence, 153, &c. Dr. Wall's inference from our Saviour's silence, 155. the dangerous consequences of such a mode of arguing, 156, 158, &c. the scriptures rather conclude against it, 160, 207. all who were to be baptized were also to be *taught*, 161, 163—207. infant-baptism cannot fairly be founded on the Jewish baptism, 244—250. it was not practised in the primitive times: the ancient Fathers cited, 253, &c. the question, for what are infants baptized? 259. Dr. Wall states that the ancient Christian church had two baptisms, 291. Mr. Gale's summary of his arguments against it, 338. his idea of the mode in which it became prevalent, 348. he asserts that all infants will be saved, 270. Dr. Wall's remarks on this, 534. in what country it began, 629.
- Innocent I., pope, i. 207, 234. a synodical epistle to him on the subject of Pelagius, from Carthage, 263. another, from Milevis, 265. another epistle from five bishops, 266. his replies, *ibid.* 282. a letter to him from Pelagius, 267, 268, 599, 629, 632—635, 637.
- Innocent III., pope, i. 460, 496.
- Innocent XII., his reception of the book of cardinal Sfondrati, i. 286.
- Irenæus, i. 34, 35. his account of the times of Clemens Romanus, 36. quoted, 44—51. a various reading by Dr. Grabe, 47. the time of his living and writing, 49, 50—86, 122. his account of sects, 309—315, 336. his account of the Valentinians, 415, 437, 547, 548, 598, 605, 626, 640, 649. ii. 181, 285, 297—322. badly translated, 304, 327, 344, 382, 388—390, 396, 500. his testimony respecting our Saviour's age examined, 556, 557—578, 579, 581. the Latin translation of his works, 580, 584, 586, 591, 595, 597—608. further examination of a corrupt passage in his text, 599—629, 632, 634, 635, 658, 668.
- Isaac, rabbi, ii. 213.
- Isæus, ii. 173.
- Isidorus Hispalensis, i. 387.
- Isidorus Pelusiotæ, his opinion of the sin attached to infants, i. 147. supposed the forger of the Decretal Epistles, 205—258, 259, 320.
- Isocrates, ii. 173, 179, 193, 194, 500.
- Ituræans, conditions imposed on the m, ii. 510.
- J.
- Jacobite Christians, i. 506.
- James, St., his meaning at chap. i. 6, 7, 8. i. 451.
- Jansenius, ii. 622.
- Jarchi, R. Solomon, ii. 221.
- Jehuda Ben Levi, a rabbi, ii. 209.
- Jenkins, Rev. Dr., i. 53.
- Jeremias, i. 637.
- Jerome, St., i. 34, 35, 39, 49, 68, 69, 83, 84, 114, 115, 122, 140, 172. his opinion of Origen, 55. of Tertullian, 64. a translator of Origen, 67. a great reader of his works, 74. his testimonies on baptism, 149, 150. concerning his own baptism, 151. he writes on the origin of the soul, 181—186. was of a hasty temper, 181. educated in the Roman church, 202—212, 213. his great reputation, *ibid.* his writings against the Pelagians, 219, 230, 243, 259. called a semi-Pelagian by M. Le Clerc, 232, —241. a passage in his works corrected by Dr. Wall from an ancient



- edition, 269. writes against Rufinus and the Origenists, 273 note. Pelagius' opposition to him in his creed, 274, n., &c. quoted, as apparently in favour of antipædobaptism, 334. misquoted by Danvers, 336, 380, 385. little ground for doubting that he was baptized in infancy, 394—403. Erasmus fancied him baptized at Rome, 395. he wore a monk's habit, *ibid.* greatly extolled religious vows, 396, 397. and virginity, 397. ordained at Antioch, 395. the errors of his early life, 398. cited, 418, 435, 436, 439, 593, 597, 599, 601, 628, 634, 640, 641. ii. 164, 199, 205, 206, 333, 334, 345, 365, 391, 508, 593, 602, 615, 620, 621, 628, 636, 640.
- Jerusalem, a synod, or meeting of bishops there, concerning Pelagius, i. 253. again, 257. the creed of its church, 617, 618. the destruction of, ii. 302, 578, 579.
- Jesuits, some say that they originated the sect of the Quakers, i. 558. some have crept in among the English antipædobaptists, 562. their shifts and disguises, to make proselytes, or to divide protestants, *ibid.* they feign themselves dissenting preachers, 563, 568. ii. 34, 471.
- Jesus Christ, his command to his apostles, to 'go and disciple all nations,' explained by Jewish customs, i. 13. illustrated farther, 14. he adopted baptism for a general sign of his religion, 17. his words to Nicodemus illustrated, 20, 63, 215, 226, 639. how understood by all the ancient Christians, 443, &c. the antipædobaptists' use of the passage, *ibid.* Bishop Burnet's interpretation of it, 445. some defenders of infant-baptism omit to use it among their proofs, 447. Dr. Wall's argument from hence examined, ii. 262. Jesus Christ is thought by some not to have taken any part of the substance of the Virgin Mary, i. 540, 541. his descent into Hades, *when* inserted into the Apostles' Creed, 622, 623. what other creeds have this clause, 623. whence it was taken, *ibid.* the fact universally admitted, *ibid.* doubts respecting his exact age, ii. 297, 300, 301, &c. these more fully discussed, 557, &c. 563, &c.
- Jewel, bishop, proves the old Decretals to be forgeries, i. 202. cited, 377, 527.
- Jews, their custom of baptizing infants, Introduction, i. 2, 5, 16, 638. they defend the custom, out of the Mosaic law, 6. their writers defend it on other grounds also, 9. believed that they themselves did not stand in need of baptism, but their proselytes only, 12, 638. baptized all children accidentally found, and such as were taken in war, *ibid.* used to bring away the children of the nations whom they conquered, 13. these customs do not affect the question of Christian pædobaptism, 15, 16. the whole body of them were baptized in Moses' time, 17. called the baptism of a proselyte his *new birth*, 19, 639. the absurdities of the Talmudists upon this notion, 19, 20. a parallel between their baptism and that of Christians, 21—24, 644. required sponsors at baptism, 22, 643. in baptism dipped *thrice*, 23, 24, 601. do still continue the baptism of infants, 27. anointed the newly baptized, 601. gave milk and honey to the newly baptized, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's arguments from the Jewish baptism examined by Mr. Gale, ii. 208—227, 228—234. Mr. Gale denies that the Jews baptized proselytes, 244. or if they did, that it will favour infant-baptism, 244—251. they had no initiatory baptism, 307. Dr. Wall's defence of himself, 493, 505, 507, 511, &c. Jews and Christians confounded together by Pagan writers, 228. the precise meaning of the word 'Jew,' 230.
- Jewish doctors or rabbis, their character, as given by Mr. Gale, ii. 90, 102. their opinions on baptism, 212, 214. instances of their writings, 215, &c., 220—227.
- Joachim, abbot, i. 434.
- Joannes Floriacensis, i. 495.
- Jochanan, rabbi, ii. 209.
- John Baptist, it is probable that he baptized children as well as adults, i. 17. ii. 155. this denied, 166, 167, 245—247. St. Ambrose is of that opinion, i. 18. why the Pharisees asked, 'Why baptizest thou then?' 27. baptized by dipping, ii. 121.
- St. John the Evangelist, his Gospel when written, i. 35. the text 1 John v. 7. seemingly acknowledged by St. Cyprian, 130. the text John iii. 5. illustrated, 20, 63, 214, 226, 443, 639, 656. ii. 669, 670.
- John, bishop of Jerusalem, a friend of Pelagius, i. 253.
- John Becold, or John of Leyden, his excesses, i. 514, 518.

- John of Lyons, a follower of Peter Waldo, i. 500.
- Johnson, his 'Julian the Apostate,' i. 384.
- Joseph, a Jewish rabbi, quoted, i. 11.
- Josephus, ii. 107, 237, 246, 302, 303, 313, 344, 510, 517, 523, 564, 566, 568, 569, 572, 574, 578, 579.
- Joshua, a Jewish rabbi, i. 25. ii. 218, 248, 249, 524.
- Judah Hakodesh, rabbi, ii. 509.
- Judas of Galilee, ii. 572, 573.
- Julian the emperor, i. 64, 145, 369, 380, 617. ii. 230, 513, 551.
- Julianus, a Pelagian bishop, i. 216, 257, 258. maintains a dispute with St. Austin, 292, 294, 457. ii. 666.
- Junius, Franc., ii. 588.
- Jurieu, M., ii. 13, 125, 347, 451.
- Justellus, i. 195.
- Justin Martyr, i. 14. quoted, 39—44. asserts baptism to be in place of circumcision, 40. his account of the way of baptizing is the most ancient of any, next to the scripture, 43, 45, 206, 443, 548, 570, 598, 602, 605, 640. ii. 10, 11, 107, 170, 176, 177, 203, 223, 228, 240, 241, 280—286, 290—297, 301, 311, 312, 330, 342—344, 383, 386, 403, 493, 504, 505, 514, 517, 544—549, 553—556, 569, 575. his mistake in chronology, 575, 577, 587, 635, 658, 661, 674, 675.
- Justina, mother of Valentinian II, i. 370, 374.
- Justinian, i. 618.
- Juvenal, ii. 192.
- Juvenis*, what age it designates, ii. 320.
- K.
- Καυνοποιία*, used to denote baptism, i. 43.
- Kennet, Dr. White, ii. 360, n.
- Kenwolf, a synod holden under him, i. 578. ii. 138, 210, 347.
- King, sir Peter, 'On the Primitive Church,' i. 71. ii. 322, 620. his History of the Apostles' Creed, i. 625.
- Kircherus, A., ii. 98.
- Kiss of peace, anciently given to all newly-baptized persons, i. 87.
- Knatchbull, sir Norton, his annotations on the New Testament, i. 24—27. wishes to restore dipping in baptism, 586. ii. 377.
- Koran, the, ii. 97.
- L.
- Labbe, an editor of the Councils, i. 194, 197.
- Lactantius, ii. 119, 548.
- Læta, daughter of Albinus, i. 241.
- Lambarde, his 'Perambulation of Kent,' ii. 506, note.
- Lanfranc, i. 479.
- Langus, his translation of Justin Martyr, ii. 545.
- Langres, the synod of, i. 576, 581.
- Languages, differ from each other so much, that scarcely an exact equivalent for an idea is found in any two, ii. 120. instances given, *ibid*.
- Laodicea, council of, i. 570, 599.
- Lateran council, (A. D. 1139,) i. 496. (A. D. 1215,) *ibid*.
- Latin Church, ii. 464.
- Laud, archbishop, his conference with Fisher, i. 180, 470, 566. ii. 405, 473.
- Laurence, a martyr, i. 574, 577.
- Laurence, St., baptizes by affusion, ii. 457.
- Leger, J., his 'History of the Vaudois churches,' i. 482, n.
- Leigh, E., his 'Critica Sacra,' ii. 197.
- Lent, one occasion of keeping it immediately before Easter, i. 206.
- Leo I, pope, author of some pieces ascribed to St. Ambrose, i. 141, 197, 320. his works published by Quesnel, 306, 473.
- Leo Modena, his history of the Jews, i. 5, 6.
- Leonilla, three sons of, i. 408.
- Leti, G., his history, ii. 161, 485.
- Libanius, was preceptor of Chrysostom, i. 389, 390. his praise of his pupil, 390.
- Libertines, freethinkers, ii. 244.
- Lightfoot, Dr., i. 3, 6, 12, 13, 16, 18, 27, 100, n. 115. ii. 225, 228, 236, 277, 342, 483, 495, 514.
- Limborch, P., his History of the Inquisition, i. 480. ii. 198, 489.
- Limbus puerorum*, a popish doctrine, i. 140, 307, 460, 468.
- Lipsius, J., ii. 233.
- Liturgy of the Walloon churches, ii. 373.
- of the French church, ii. 373.
- English, ii. 462. a remarkable edition noted, *ibid*. revival of, 648, n.
- of Geneva, ii. 462, 463.
- Locke, John, his 'Paraphrase of St. Paul,' i. 214. 'On the human Understanding,' ii. 71, 157, 321, 375.
- Lokman, his Arabian fables, ii. 189.
- Lollards, i. 466, 522, 523.
- Lombard, Peter, i. 460. ii. 263.
- Lucas Brugensis, ii. 109, 199.
- Lucas Tudensis, his writings against the Albigenes, i. 497.
- Lucian, quoted, i. 81, 195, 230, 231.
- Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, i. 367.

- Luciferians, i. 488, 489, 499, 500.  
 Ludolphus, J., his lexicon, ii. 201.  
 Luigerus, i. 408.  
 Luther, objects to conditional baptism, i. 199. rejects the Decretals, 202, 469, 481, 497, 513. protests against the excesses of the anabaptists, 514. ii. 581.  
 Lutheran divines, opinion of certain, on the faith of infants, i. 174.  
 Lutherans, allow lay-baptism in certain cases, i. 469. ii. 45, 655.  
 Lycophron, quoted, ii. 61, 78.  
 Lycurgus, ii. 194.  
 Lydius, Balthazar, his 'Waldensia,' i. 517.  
 Lyndewode's 'Constitutions,' i. 578.  
 Lyonists, i. 480, 488, 489, 494, 499.  
 Lysias, ii. 181.  
 Lysis, his epistle quoted, ii. 83.  
     M.  
 Mabillon, i. 478.  
 Macaire, or Macarius, an author produced by Mr. Stennet, i. 324, 357.  
 Macedonians, an ancient sect, ii. 437. condemned by several councils, 619—621.  
 Macedonius, i. 618.  
 Magdeburg, the centuriators of, i. 87, 197, 376, 476, 477, 498, 632. ii. 663, 665.  
 Magnus, a friend of Cyprian, i. 572. St. Cyprian's letter to him, ii. 131, 136, 137.  
 Mahomet, i. 125, 417, 422.  
 Mahometans, ii. 97. their ablutions, 108, 109, 211, 433, 445.  
 Maimonides, quoted, i. 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 19, 21. ii. 102, 209—211, 223, 236, 248—250, 307, 341, 435, 437, 441, 516, 583.  
 Maldonatus, i. 629.  
 Malebranche, his singular opinion about original sin in infants, i. 174.  
 Malt, a Spanish Jesuit, i. 564.  
 Man, ought to have been rendered 'any person,' in John iii. 5. ii. 265, 528, 529.  
 Manichees, i. 151, 153, 155, 310. St. Augustine was one, 406. they condemn all baptism, 407. are opposed in Pelagius' creed, 274, n. 276—293. their tenets, especially on baptism, 417, 483, 484, 486, 489, 490, 494, 495, 498. their opinion on Christ's flesh, 541. some sectaries who preceded the Waldenses, held their opinions, 498, 500. ii. 664.  
 Marcellinus, a Carthaginian nobleman, i. 223, 226—228.  
 Marcellus, a bishop at the council of Nice, i. 623.  
 Marcellus, governor of Judæa, ii. 578.  
 Marcion, i. 310. ii. 156. his doctrine on baptism, i. 419, 540, 541.  
 Marcionists, i. 194, 199, 313, 314, 419, 420, 541.  
 Marius Mercator, i. 71, 125, n. 234, 257, 295, 296, 320, 634.  
 Malborough, the duke of, the wording of his patent, ii. 153.  
 Maronites, i. 506. baptize infants, 508. and give them the eucharist, *ibid.* 637.  
 Marriage, a peculiar form used by some among the English antipædobaptists, i. 552.  
 Marshall, Steven, i. 87, 97, 316, 403, 532, 679. ii. 27.  
 Martial, ii. 405.  
 Martyr, P., i. 671.  
 Martyrs dying unbaptized, i. 449, 450.  
 Martyrology, Dutch, a work often cited by Danvers, i. 359, 412, 466, 477, 515.  
 Mary, the Virgin, a text of St. Austin concerning her, i. 251. various readings of it, 252. the modern papists' opinion concerning her holiness, 251. that of the ancient fathers, *ibid.* 252. her being without sin, ii. 16.  
 Masson, Dom, i. 495.  
 Μαθητεύω means to *disciple*, or *make disciples*, i. 44, 651, &c. what its real meaning is, ii. 162, 168, &c. authorities cited, 168, &c. etymology, 170—173. classic authors, 179, &c. it cannot signify to *make disciples*, 187. what is the true meaning of *μαθητής*, 190. modern critics cited, 196, &c. its sense argued from the ancient and modern versions of scripture, 200, &c. from the Fathers, 202, &c. 295, 339. Dr. Wall's interpretation of both words defended against Mr. Gale's objections, 487, &c. further illustrations, 489, &c.  
 Matthew, John, an anabaptist leader, i. 518.  
 Maxentius, Joannes, i. 321.  
 Maximus, the Cynic, i. 380.  
 Maximus, a bishop of Jerusalem, i. 376.  
 Maximus, an usurper, sets up for emperor, i. 370. attacks Valentinian, 371. is slain, *ibid.*  
 Mechilta, a rabbi, cited by Selden, i. 7.  
 Mede, Joseph, i. 585.  
 Mehrning, Jacob, i. 412, 515.  
 Melancthon, P., i. 671.  
 Melania, i. 235, 280.  
 Meletius, i. 378, 388, 389, 394, 433.  
 Menander, i. 310, 311, 319.  
 Mengrelia, or Circassia, i. 507, 508,



- &c. the ignorance and neglect of the people in religious matters, 311, &c.
- Menno, of Friesland, an antipædobaptist, founder of the Mennonites, or Minnists, i. 519.
- Mentz, the church of, i. 577.
- Mercator. See *Marius*.
- Messalians, i. 147. their tenets, especially on baptism, 417.
- Middle state, between heaven and hell; notions of it, i. 141, 546, &c. for infants and others dying unbaptized, 454—456.
- Milevis, council of (A. D. 416.), i. 263, 632. ii. 664.
- Milk and honey given to newly-baptized persons, i. 596, 597, 601, 634. ii. 256.
- Milk and wine given to the newly-baptized, i. 634.
- Milton, quoted, ii. 67.
- Minchas, a rabbi, ii. 209.
- Minnists, the Dutch, i. 349, 489, 519. their present state, opinions, differences, &c. 520, &c. 540. ii. 372, 410, 448, 452, 464.
- Miraculum*, what the word properly signifies, i. 440.
- Misnah, the Jewish, quoted, i. 10, 209. ii. 210, 211, 493, 509, 512.
- Mnason, how a disciple, ii. 492.
- Monica, St. Augustine's mother, ii. 406.
- Monk's habit, worn by religious in the time of St. Jerome, ii. 396.
- Monnulus, bishop of Girba, ii. 124.
- Montanism, ii. 610.
- Montanists, i. 54, 62. put much faith in dreams, 304. Tertullian was one, *ibid*.
- Montanus, i. 54.
- More, sir Thomas, his 'Dialogues,' ii. 506, n.
- Morley, bp. George, his refusal to join French presbyterian congregation, ii. 45, and n. 417.
- Moschus, quoted, ii. 77.
- Moses Mikotsi, a rabbi cited by Selden, i. 5, 7.
- Muggletonians, an English sect, ii. 442.
- Munzer, Thomas, a German anabaptist, i. 513, 514.
- Muscovites, their practice as to baptism, i. 419, 506, 589, &c., 637.
- Muscovy, i. 419, 506, ii. 629.
- Musculus, W., i. 581.  
N.
- Nachmanides, a rabbi cited by Selden, i. 7.
- Naucerus, Jo., his 'Chronicon,' i. 498, ii. 225.
- Nazaratus, a master of Pythagoras, ii. 183, 500.
- Nazarenæ, i. 125.
- Nazarius, i. 408.
- Nectarius, is chosen bishop before he is baptized, i. 387. nothing known of his parents, 388. so that the argument of the antipædobaptists fails, *ibid*. 391.
- Negro's Advocate, a book so called, i. 323, 324.
- Nemesianus, an African bishop, ii. 528.
- Neocæsarea, council of, i. 94, 399, 572, ii. 27, 135, 361, 394, 407, 456, 658.
- Nestorianism, i. 505, 506.
- Nestorius, is joined by Cælestius and his party, i. 257, 272, n. one of his errors, 271, n. 626.
- Neubrigensis, Gulielmus, his *Historia Anglicana*, i. 495.
- Nicander, the scholiast on, ii. 78.
- Nice, council of, i. 156, 399, 424, 433, 611, ii. 386.
- Nicene Fathers, abused, i. 437.
- Nicephorus, his account of Constantine's baptism, i. 364.
- Nicetas, his comment on Gregory Nazianzen, i. 103.
- Nicholson, bishop, his letter on the font at Bridekirk, i. 54, 358, ii. 125, 189.
- Nicodemus, our Saviour's discourse with him, ii. 310, 311.
- Nicolaitans, i. 310.
- Νιττηρ*, its usual signification, ii. 436.
- Nizzachon, a Hebrew book, ii. 212—214.
- Noëtus, i. 431.
- Nonjurors, no friends to the church, ii. 6. many of the English clergy charged by Mr. Gale with being so, 33, 41.
- Nonnus, ii. 573.
- Noris, cardinal Henry, quotes the disputed canon of the council of Carthage (A. D. 418), i. 306.
- Novatian, i. 571, 572, 600, 611. the first person baptized by sprinkling, ii. 134, 135, 338, 456, 630.
- Novatians. Pelagius' creed is opposed to them, i. 273, 289. their opinions on baptism, 411. did not reject infant-baptism, 413. ever accounted schismatics, 662. ii. 658, 661, 662.
- Novatus, ii. 156.
- Nye, Stephen, i. 439, n.  
O.
- Observator, a work (by R. L' Estrange?), ii. 461, n.
- Ὁμολογία*, the baptismal profession, ii. 29.
- Optatus Milevitanus, quoted, i. 100, 161.



- Oracle portending the overthrow of Christianity, i. 196.
- Orange, the council of, i. 599.
- Orders, who were anciently to be admitted to, i. 209.
- Ordibarians, i. 488, 489.
- Origen, i. 33, 39. a Platonist, 54. quoted, 64—78. is accused of Pelagianism, 68. St. Jerome's opinion of him, 55. which of his works are authentic, 66, 67. attests infant-baptism, 74. translations of his works by St. Jerome and Rufinus, 66, 67, 70, 74—76. his parents were Christians, 78. his father a martyr, *ibid.* Jerome's version of his book *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, 213. his opinion on infants' souls, 225—240. speaks of infant baptism, 344. a passage from him on the word *baptize*, 538, 539. quoted, 540—543, 548. his opinion on Christ's soul, 542. debate whether his works should be received or condemned, 543. apologies for him, *ibid.* 602, 608, 616, 640, 645, ii. 118, 119, 180, 181, 185, 202, 242, 247, 276, 285, 295, 302, 313, 314, 320, 328, 331, 337, 345, 382, 384, 390—393, 408, 432, 449, 500, 501, 518—520, 523, 546, 551, 579, 587, 593, 603, 606, 607, 610, 616, 617, 619, 620. why some things are found only in the Latin version of his works, 621—628, 629, 632, 634, 635, 668.
- Original sin, in the primitive times was judged to affect all Adam's descendants, i. 40. Irenæus' opinion, 44. Origen's, 69. that of the Pelagians, 83, 99, 176. infants acknowledged to lie under it, 147. St. Austin's opinion, 163, &c. his difference with Pelagius on the subject, 236, &c. the opinions of the more ancient Fathers, 258. of St. Jerome, in opposition to that of Pelagius, 262. of late years the Jesuits have undermined the doctrine; and the court of Rome winks at it, 285. is denied by those inclined to Socinianism, 342. what kind of death was thought by the ancients to have been brought on mankind by it, 455. Mr. Gale's remarks on this subject examined by Dr. Wall, ii. 544, &c.
- Orosius, a scholar of St. Austin, comes to Jerusalem and accuses Pelagius, i. 253. writes his 'Apologetic,' 254, 268, 320. his account of Theodosius, 375.
- Orthlibenses, i. 488, 489.
- Osiander, his 'Epitome,' i. 375, 412.
- Osorius, Hieronymus, i. 508.
- Ottius, J. H., his History of Anabaptists, i. 517, 526.
- Ovid, ii. 77, 79.
- P.
- P., E., antipædobaptist preacher, i. 566.
- Pacianus, i. 455.
- Pagi, A., ii. 364, 566.
- Παλιγγενεσία, ii. 587, 588.
- Palladius, his life of Chrysostom, i. 388.
- Pamelius, an editor of Tertullian, i. 61. ii. 326, 613.
- Pamphilus, his defence of Origen, i. 543, 616.
- Panætius the philosopher, ii. 196.
- Pancratius, i. 408.
- Papebrochius, D., compiler of the *Acta Sanctorum*, i. 380, 381, 383. ii. 364.
- Papists have earnestly laboured to embroil protestants with each other on the question of infant-baptism, i. 352, 354, 356. object to protestants the bad character of Henry VIII, 368. their opinions of unbaptized infants, 466. called all protestants anabaptists, 518, 525. ii. 471, 482, 595, 675.
- Paræus, i. 472.
- Parvulus*, to what age it reaches, ii. 320.
- Paterines, i. 480, 488, 489.
- Patrippassians, i. 432.
- Patritius, father of St. Austin, i. 403, 406, &c.
- Paul, St., his meaning of the word *holy* in 1 Cor. vii. 14, i. 114, 215, 239, 240, 405, 474, 635. ii. 379, 380, 468, 469, 614, 616, 660, 671. what he meant by the 'falling away' in 2 Thess. ii., 637.
- Paul Sarpi, father, i. 462.
- Paulianists, i. 122, 156, 421, 437.
- Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, i. 394, 395.
- Paulinus, bishop of Nola, i. 104, 115. his testimony, 209, &c. 358, 640. ii. 396, 615.
- Paulinus, the deacon, i. 70. his life of St. Ambrose, 215, 392, 393. suspected of being a forgery, *ibid.* he challenges Pelagius, 70, 222, 240, 320.
- Paulus Samosatenus, i. 120, 124.
- Pearson, bishop, his 'Annales Paulini,' i. 36, 38, 50, 617, 624, 626, 632. ii. 564, 565, 572, 609, 623.
- Pelagian bishops (eighteen) send a letter to the bishop of Thessalonica, i. 273, n. 292, n.
- Pelagian controversy, i. 63, 149.
- Pelagian heresy, a short account of its rise, &c., i. 216, &c. only one account

- of it (M. Le Clerc's) in English, 217. Pelagianism has been accounted heretical doctrine in all ages and all churches, 231. in the East it was called the *Cælestian* heresy, 282. is favoured by the court of Rome at present, 285, 286. Mr. Gale asserts that it is falsely charged on the anti-pædobaptists, ii. 36.
- Pelagians. The sect began (A.D. 410), i. 151, 217. denied original sin, 83, 217, 227, 236, &c. practised infant-baptism, 83, 99, 217, 227. asserted *actual* sin in infants, 176, 227. object to certain doctrines of catholics, 187. held a middle state, between heaven and hell, 223. asserted that unbaptized children might be saved, but should not come to the kingdom of heaven, 224, 266. assert the redemption of baptized infants, 228. exalt man's free-will, *ibid.* their opinion concerning the rich man, 246. concerning swearing, 248. mistranslate St. Chrysostom, 258, 259. are much pressed with the argument from infant-baptism, 288. their opinions declared heretical in England, 524. cast odium on the doctrine of original sin, 457—472, 632, 633, 642, ii. 15, 376, 465, 551, 658, 663, —667.
- Pelagius, author of the heresy, i. 63, 64, 114. some account of him, 217, 219, 411. his confession of faith, 219. none of his works (though a Briton) have been translated into English, 219, 268. called *Pelagius Brito*, by way of distinction, 220. wrote some learned works before he adopted his new opinions, *ibid.* denied original sin, 527. denied God's grace, 232—234. spoke reservedly on the point, 233. persuades pope Zosimus to befriend him, 234. St. Austin's controversy with him, 220—290. his 'Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles,' 240. his book 'Of the Abilities of Nature,' 250. lived much at Jerusalem, but wrote in the Latin tongue, 252, 253. is arraigned at Jerusalem, 253, and at Diospolis, 254. recants certain opinions, 254, 280. writes to Innocent, bishop of Rome, and sends his *Libellus fidei* or *Creed*, which (Innocent being dead) is delivered to his successor Zosimus, 267, 277. this *Creed* supposed by some to be the same as Jerome's *Explanatio symboli*, 267. given at length, 269—277. the letter is lost, except some fragments preserved by St. Austin, 277. he confesses that he never heard any one deny baptism to infants, 279, 289, 294. at length owns that they are baptized for remission of sins, 280. maintains that his doctrines are not heretical, 287. John Philpot erroneously asserts that he denied infant-baptism, 526, 527. thinks infants will be in the 'middle state,' 141, 223. See i. 640, ii. 16, 29, 409, 465, 615, 616, 635, 658, 663, 606.
- Pelopidas, ii. 182.
- Pericles, ii. 283.
- Perionius, his translation of Justin Martyr, ii. 545.
- Perizonius, ii. 172.
- Perkins, i. 472.
- Prepetua, a martyr, her case discussed between Vincentius Victor and St. Austin, i. 302, &c. Bishop Fell's edition of her martyrdom, 303.
- Perrin, J. P., his history of the Waldenses, i. 481, 482, 496.
- Perron, cardinal, i. 195. his 'Reply to King James,' 351, 364, 567.
- Petavius, D., i. 195, 232, 364, 375, 423, 424, 439. ii. 87, 125, 135, 139, 229, 232, 298, 431, 456, 558—561, 562.
- Peter, St., cited as a strong witness against infant-baptism, by Mr. Gale, ii. 266.
- Peter Bruis, i. 485. accused of denying infant-baptism, 491. burnt, *ibid.* his opinions, 492, 494. his history, 501, &c.
- Petrobrusians, a sect of the 12th century, i. 318, 342, 480. accused of various errors, especially the denial of infant-baptism, 491, &c., 499. charged with Manichean principles, 494, 497, 501. it is probable that they did reject infant-baptism, 501. they were the first who taught that the Lord's supper ought not to be continued, *ibid.* whence their name, 491, 504, 515. reject psalm-singing, 551. extol the Lord's Prayer, 552, 647, 686. ii. 464, 667.
- Petrus Blesensis, i. 463.
- Petrus Cluniacensis, i. 206, 491, 494, 499, 501—504, 551, 686.
- Phavorinus, his lexicon, ii. 67, 74, 430.
- Phereponus, John, a name assumed by M. Le Clerc, i. 438.
- Philastrius, i. 315.
- Philip, St., his baptism of the eunuch, ii. 122, 206.
- Philo Judæus, ii. 238, 313, 320, 509, 517.
- Philoponus, J., the first tritheist, i. 434.

- Philpot, John, his letter on baptism, i. 526, 527.
- Philegon, ii. 302, 303, 344, 579.
- Phœbadius, i. 271, n.
- Photinians, i. 118, 122. ii. 22.
- Photinus, i. 120, 124, 125, 271, 421, 614. his belief, 616, 617. ii. 22.
- Φωτισμός, used to denote *baptism*, i. 43, 216.
- Φωτιστήριον, ii. 458.
- Φωτισόμενος, signifying *baptized*, ii. 177.
- Φωτίζω, signifying *to baptize*, ii. 591.
- Photius, his *Bibliotheca* cited, i. 295, 296. his high reputation, *ibid.* 329.
- Picards (or Beghards), i. 488, 497, 515, 517.
- Picolominaeus, Jac., i. 498.
- Picture. Dr. Wall wishes for a cheap picture (print) of our Saviour with a little child, ii. 672.
- Pigres, whether author of the *Batrachomyomachia*, ii. 62.
- Pilate, Pontius, difficulties as to the exact time of his government, ii. 561, &c.
- Pilchdorf, P., i. 488, 497, 498, 500, 517.
- Pillonniere, F. de la, ii. 542, n.
- Pindar, quoted, ii. 64, 182. his scholiast quoted, *ibid.*
- Pinianus, i. 235, 280.
- Piphles, i. 486.
- Pithæus, P., i. 495.
- Pius IV., i. 489.
- Platina, his *Lives of the Popes*, i. 331.
- Plato, his opinion concerning infants' souls, i. 225. ii. 69, 82, 181, 182, 194, 195, 295.
- Pliny, i. 602. ii. 73, 93.
- Plunge, its etymology from πλύνω, ii. 73.
- Plutarch, ii. 62, 66—68, 81, 84, 173, 179, 181, 182, 194, 295.
- Pococke, Dr. Edward, i. 537, n. ii. 96, 102—106, 108—110, 250, 435, 437—439, 441—443.
- Poland, antipædobaptists in, i. 568.
- Politian, his version of Callimachus, ii. 78, 79.
- Pollux, J., his *lexicon* cited, ii. 65, 67, 84.
- Polycarp, i. 50, 437, 547. ii. 320, 544, 557, 603, 658.
- Polycrates, a bishop of Ephesus, ii. 323, 324, 609.
- Polygamy, an argument against, i. 96.
- Pontius, i. 408.
- Poole, M., his *Synopsis*, ii. 442, 444, 495, 659.
- Porphyrius, his slander of Origen, i. 78. ii. 513.
- Possevinus, i. 377, 419.
- Possidius, i. 320. his life of St. Austin, 403, 404.
- Pouring, or Perfusion, the church of England allows it, ii. 460. this does not justify mere sprinkling a few drops of water, 428. Dr. Wall allows perfusion to be sufficient, but prefers dipping, 458, 642. further remarks, 461, &c. 641, &c. it was introduced by the followers of Calvin, 463.
- Prædestinarians, the followers of St. Austin so called, i. 296. the church of Rome anciently was zealous for this side, 297. that of France the contrary, *ibid.* modern, 471, 473.
- Prædestination, whether the more ancient Fathers agreed with St. Austin respecting it, i. 258. Cardinal Sfondrata's book on the subject, 285. the church of Rome anciently maintained the opinion, *ibid.* 297.
- Prateolus, Gabriel, his work on heretics, ii. 662.
- Praxeas, Tertullian's writings against him, i. 425, 426, 431.
- Prayer, Book of Common, of Edward VI, i. 579, 584. review of it, A. D. 1661, 583.
- Prayers for the dead, advised by Vincentius Victor, i. 304. an ancient custom relating to the dead, *ibid.*
- Praylius, a bishop of Jerusalem, i. 283.
- Preachers ought to subscribe Articles of Religion, in order to detect disguised papists, &c., i. 508.
- Prejudices arising in illiterate persons, i. 654.
- Presbyterians, opinion of the ancients respecting private baptism, i. 189. of the moderns, *ibid.* 190. ii. 45, 463, 465. their baptism, 630. their tenets, 651. they separate from the church of England, 652. they were formerly called Puritans, *ibid.*
- Pretender, the, many of the English clergy charged by Mr. Gale with favouring him, ii. 33.
- Prideaux, Dr., his *Connexion of History*, i. 10, n. ii. 509.
- Priorius, an editor of Tertullian, ii. 153, 230.
- Priscillianists, are opposed in Pelagius' creed, i. 274, n. ii. 664.
- Private baptism in houses, unknown to St. Austin, i. 188. its abuse very great at the present day, *ibid.* the church of England's injunction concerning it, 189. presbyterians formerly objected to it, 445. but at present use it almost exclusively, 189, 190. and will so baptize the



children of churchmen, when their own clergyman has refused it, *ibid.* was first granted as a privilege to royal persons alone, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's opinion of it, 405. ii. 463. his objections to it, 644, &c. difficulties attending it, 647, 648. bishop Compton, 648, n.

Prodicus, ii. 183, 194.

Professions made at baptism, i. 601, 603, 604. two professions made by adults, 627. one for infants, 628. See *Creed*.

Proselytes, Jewish, were baptized as well as circumcised, i. 3, 17. Mr. Gale denies this, ii. 243. their infant children also were baptized, i. 9, 17. if a woman great with child be baptized, her infant needs not baptism, 100. 'proselytes of the gate,' 19.

Prosper, author of some pieces ascribed to St. Ambrose, i. 141. quoted, 235, 257, 297, 306. his works against Pelagianism, 320, 472, 473.

Protestants designedly embroiled with each other by the papists, i. 352, 354, 356. their opinion of the salvability of persons dying unbaptized, 444. as to infants, 467, &c. whether a protestant may join in a popish service, 671.

Prussia, the king of, prohibits M. Le Clerc's writings, i. 440.

Psalm-singing, rejected by many English antipædobaptists, i. 551.

Psychici, the catholic Christians so called by Tertullian, i. 54.

Ptolemy Philadelphus, ii. 576.

Publicani (or Popellicani), some of the Waldenses, i. 495, 499.

Puer, what age it designates, ii. 320, 321.

Purchas, his Pilgrims, i. 590.

Puritans, or Cathari, i. 480, 483, 486, 488, 489. in queen Elizabeth's reign, 563, 664, 681.

Pythagoras, ii. 181, 183.

#### Q.

Questiones ad Antiochum, ascribed to Athanasius, i. 242, 316, 330.

Questiones ad Orthodoxos, a work ascribed to Justin Martyr, i. 41, 328. ii. 551.

Quakers, their opinions on the subject of baptism, i. 16, 86, 448, 466, 552. disputes with the antipædobaptists, 577. their enthusiasm, 558. they prevail most in England, *ibid.* said to have been devised by the Jesuits, *ibid.* their tenets, *ibid.* 415, 486, 487, 489, 490, 495, 501, 518, 520, 534, 542. ii. 128, 244, 287, 369, 442, 455, 468,

630, 651. how they elude the eucharist as set forth in Scripture, i. 656. refuse baptism, 672. some would fain deny them to be Christians, 686.

Quesnell, P., i. 205. his edition of the Canons, 306, and n.

Quintilla, a preacher on baptism, i. 417.

Quirinius, governor of Judæa, his census, ii. 569.

#### R.

Rabbins, their estimation in Mr. Gale's eyes, ii. 90, 102, 215, 221. their character, 222—226, 251, 340, 437, 441, 442, 512, 514.

Radulphus Ardensis, i. 495.

Rebaptizing, ancient disputes in the church on this point, i. 420, 421.

*Regenerate*, how Cyprian understood it, ii. 11. for *baptized*, 669.

Regeneration. Baptism often signified by this term, both among the Jews and early Christians, i. 19, 20, 43, 106. St. Paul's use of the word in this sense, 20, 43. the Christians of the first four centuries always denoted baptism by it, 43, 45, 48, 106. the term applied to the *world*, the *body*, the *flesh*, &c., 47. spoken of by Origen, 76. by St. Austin, 173, &c. used as synonymous with *baptism* by St. Augustine, 447. and by the church of England, *ibid.* Baptism so called by the Jews, 639. also by the heathens, *ibid.* understood in this sense by the ancient Christians, *ibid.* 656. meaning of the word altered in modern times, *ibid.* in the sense of baptism? ii. 293, 307, 344. its occurrence in Scripture? 307, &c. 312. Mr. Bernard's views and reasoning on the meaning of it, 366—371. Mr. Gale's arguments examined, 582, &c. difference between regeneration and repentance, 586.

Reinerius, his writings against the Waldenses, i. 488, 493, 495, 498, 499, 500, 541.

Reland, A., ii. 97.

Remonstrants, of Dort, i. 231, 236. their opinion on infant-baptism, 356, 472. a confession of two ministers, 522.

Ricaut. See *Rycaut*.

Rigaltius, N., an editor of Tertullian, i. 61, 86, 452. his opinion on infant-baptism, 343. some notice of his edition of Cyprian, *ibid.* note. quotes Tertullian, 343, n. bishop Fell's judgment of him, 344. his want of fairness, *ibid.* ii. 19, 123, 134, 169, 198, 232, 326, 613.

Rivetius, A., i. 97, 351, 377, 567, ii. 27.



- Rochelle, the siege of, ii. 161, 485.  
 Rochester, an ancient register belonging to the see of, i. 564. detected some designs of the Jesuits, and was stolen away in the time of king James II, 565. it has never been recovered, ii. 692.  
 Rogers, Rev. Daniel, wishes to revive dipping, i. 585, 586.  
 Rome, a council at, i. 621. account of it from the Talmud, ii. 220. church of, See *Church, Papists*.  
 Romilius, a Roman consul, ii. 283.  
 Roque, M. de la, i. 567.  
 Rotterdam, church of, ii. 417.  
 Rufinus, i. 34. a translator of Origen, 67. the freedoms taken by him, *ibid.* 74. an enemy to the doctrine of original sin, 70. called a Syrian, and why, 71. his exposition of the Apostles' Creed, 273. n. his account of Gregory Nazianzen, 381, 383, 509, 596. his comment on the Creed, 622, 623, ii. 305, 333, 335—337, 345, 621—628.  
 Runcarians, i. 488, 499, 500.  
 Rupertus, a writer of the twelfth century, i. 577.  
 Russen, David, his 'Fundamentals without a Foundation,' i. 26, n. 552. his borrowing from Ware's 'Foxe's and Firebands,' 563. he alludes to the register of Rochester, 565. quoted, 590. ii. 35, 371, 482.  
 Rycaut, sir P., his History, i. 505, 506, 507, 509, 512, 637.  
     S.  
 Sabæans, their practice as to baptism, i. 420.  
 Sabbatarians, some English antipædobaptists are such, i. 553.  
 Sabellians, i. 427, 428, 431.  
 Sabellius, i. 431, 432.  
 Sabinus, a Macedonian, i. 437.  
 Sacheverell, Dr., his sermon quoted, ii. 47, note.  
 Sadoc, a Pharisee, ii. 572.  
 Saffold, a London empiric, i. 56.  
 Saints, its meaning in ancient times, ii. 671. why left off, *ibid.* difficulty of restoring it, 672.  
 Salmasius, his letter to Justus Pacius quoted, i. 350, 632.  
 Samaritans, modern, their daily ablutions, ii. 107.  
 Sanctification, used to denote baptism, i. 87, 114, 152, 213. the scripture 1 Cor. vii. 14. to be so interpreted, 114. so the Jews interpreted the word in the Old Testament, 115. so all the ancient Christians, 215.  
 Sanctius, his 'Minerva,' ii. 171.  
 Sanhedrim, Jewish, its character, ii. 223.  
 Sardinia, 'Epistola Episcoporum in Sardinia exulum,' i. 321.  
 Saturninus, governor of Judæa, ii. 569, &c., 577.  
 Saturninus, a heretic, i. 310.  
 Saville, sir H., his edition of Chrysostom, i. 142.  
 Savoy conference, ii. 648.  
 Scaliger, J., his opinion on baptizing for the dead, i. 313. ii. 62, 79, 225, 271, 305, 334, 514. roughly handled by Petavius, 562, 566. his 'Scaligerana,' 581.  
 Schelstratus, E., i. 195.  
 Schism, different opinions of its guilt holden by the ancients and the moderns, i. 94. a thing too general; its guilt, 520. a dissuasive from it, 657, &c. its sinfulness urged by our Saviour and by the apostles, 658. what errors justify separation, 660. some persons think best to set up different churches, 662. its sad extent both in England and Holland, 665. cannot be justified from mere difference of church ceremonies, 666, 667. who are schismatics, 669. a case argued, 669, 670. whether the antipædobaptists are guilty of schism, 672. what points are fundamental articles of faith, *ibid.* the particular age of receiving baptism not fundamental, 673, 677. how parties who differ on such points ought to settle the difference, 677. men ought not to divide for mere mistaken opinions, 678. the antipædobaptists ought not to forsake the communion of the church of England, 679. schism so common in England, that it is very hard to repent of it, 681. common in Holland, *ibid.* schismatics tolerated among Christian nations, yet not guiltless in the sight of God, *ibid.* Christians of Africa and Europe differ as to the validity of baptism given by schismatics, 687. Dr. Wall's remarks on this subject censured by Mr. Gale, ii. 37, &c. his definition of schism, 37. those are truly schismatics, who give just cause for separation, 38, 39. its guilt. It ought to be preached against and written against, 373. its recent spread in England, *ibid.* 386, 401, 409, 415. Mr. Gale's exceptions to Dr. Wall's remarks considered, 412, &c. more prevalent in England (and Holland) than in any other country, 650. See *Separation*.

*Scoti* and *Scotia* refer to Ireland, i. 220.

Scripture, a rule in religious controversies, ii. 148, 149. its authority acknowledged, 152.

Scudamore, lord, ii. 46.

Seal-ring, Clemens Alexandrinus recommends an impress for one, i. 52.

Sebastian, C., i. 577.

Secundus, the father of Chrysostom, i. 389.

Selden, John, i. 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 24. ii. 236, 516.

Seleucians, an ancient sect, i. 419.

Semipelagians, quote St. Austin as in their favour, i. 154, 155. M. Le Clerc reckons St. Jerome to be one, 232. admit original sin in infants, 296, 473.

Senior, what age it designates, ii. 320.

Separation, a dissuasive from it on account of religious differences, i. 657. what errors overthrow the foundation of Christian faith, 660. unity to be diligently studied, 661. many separate without reason, 662. the evil of this, *ibid.* Christ ought not to be divided, 663, 665. difference of opinion no sufficient ground for separation, 663. difference in rites and ceremonies no sufficient ground, 665. the primitive Christians thought so, 666. a case whether or not a man ought to separate, 669, 670. the only cases in which scripture justifies separation, 671. good men wish all Christians to be united, ii. 433. pride leads people to it, 650. very prevalent in England, *ibid.* the guilt of it, 653, 660. See *Schism*.

Serira Gaon, a rabbi, ii. 209.

Sfondrata, cardinal, his book on original sin, i. 285. some account of it and other pieces to which it gave rise, *ibid.* n.

Shem Tob, rabbi, ii. 222.

Siccius Dentatus, a Roman general, ii. 282.

Simeon Metaphrastes, i. 389.

Simeon, rabbi, ii. 222.

Simon Magus, i. 310. ii. 592.

Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, i. 193. baptizes St. Ambrose, 392.

Simplicius Verinus (i. e. Salmasius), his letter to Justus Pacius quoted, ii. 350.

Siricius, pope, i. 193. his decretals, 200—207. ii. 15.

Sirmondus, his publications, i. 320.

Siscidenses, i. 488, 489, 494.

Sleep of the soul, the opinion of some modern antipædobaptists on the point,

i. 186. opinions of various persons and parties on it, 545, &c. viz. Calvin's, 546. that of the Dutch Minnists, *ibid.* the German antipædobaptists, *ibid.* the English antipædobaptists, *ibid.* that of the primitive Christians, *ibid.* 548. of the English protestants at the reformation, 549. in Q. Elizabeth's reign, *ibid.* some antipædobaptists deny it, 551. ii. 412.

Sleidan, J., i. 518, 525.

Snape, Dr. A., his writings against bishop Hoadly, ii. 542, n.

Socinians, some would now abolish baptism in Christian nations, i. 16. have lately changed their doctrine, 120. Ebion and Cerinthus were the first, 122. their opinion of the atonement, 127. attempt to discredit the Fathers, 421—423, 434, 435. their tracts, 434, n. 539. many of them among the English antipædobaptists, 539, 612. expelled from Poland, 521. enter Holland, and join the Minnists, *ibid.* these were antipædobaptists, *ibid.* but the first Dutch Socinians did not absolutely refuse infant-baptism, 522. all in Poland called anabaptists, 569. needlessly lashed by Dr. Wall, ii. 16. they are not so despicable as he thinks, 17. Mr. Gale's anger at the charge of there being some among the antipædobaptists, 36. he asserts that some very rank ones are found in the church of England, 129. See i. 487. ii. 23, 244, 245, 374, 385—387, 411, 412, 479, 522, 651, 652.

Socinians, modern English, fancy that Pelagius quite agrees with them, i. 268. their mean opinion of Jesus Christ, 616. some individuals among the English antipædobaptists, 555. they rail and scoff at the most awful truths, 556.

—— pamphlet, on Creeds, i. 555.  
—— work burned by a Dutch printer, i. 218.

Socinus, quoted, i. 16, 568, 569. ii. 375. the reason why he wished to abolish baptism, i. 539.

Socrates, the historian, i. 117, 137, 369, 370, 375—377, 388, 421, 432, 434, 437, 509, 623. ii. 663.

Socrates, the philosopher, ii. 72, 181, 182, 295.

Socrates Scholasticus, ii. 181.

Solomon, a Jewish rabbi, quoted, i. 8. ii. 209, 210.

Sophocles, quoted, ii. 602.

Soto, D. a, i. 584.

- Sozomenus the historian, i. 368, 377, 388, 390, 391, 433, 540, 591, 615.
- Spanheim, his notes on Callimachus, ii. 78.
- Spanish church, uses one immersion, i. 595.
- Spelman, sir Henry, i. 578.
- Spencer, his notes on Origen, ii. 546.
- 'Spirits in prison.' Many of the oldest Christians conceived that the gospel and baptism were communicated to the patriarchs in their separate state, i. 48.
- Spondanus, i. 195. ii. 559.
- Sponsors, were required by the Jews as well as Christians, i. 22. more ancient than the antipædobaptists allow, 62, 170, 603.
- Sprinkling, or aspersion, when first used, ii. 127. why, *ibid.* St. Cyprian its earliest advocate, *ibid.* 130, 454. whether used within two hundred and fifty years after Christ, 134. Novatian the first instance, *ibid.* the church never justified it from scripture or antiquity, 138, 139. why do the clergy of England still continue it? 139—141. it may perhaps be allowed in certain cases, but cannot be urged as an ordinance of Christ, 156. Dr. Wall's remarks on Mr. Gale on this point, 422, &c. his own opinion of it, especially of such ministers as sprinkle as *little* water as possible, 428. no very early quotations in favour of it, and why, 455. bishop Burnet's remark on it, 458, 461. Dr. Wall's own suggestions, 461—465. was first introduced by the presbyterians, 463, 465. further remarks, 641, &c.
- Stennet, Mr. Joseph, his 'Answer to Russen,' i. 26, and n. 324, 345, 351. cites an author named Macaire, 357. thinks Constantine was born of Christian parents, 365. his interpretation of the text John iii. 5, 444. asserts that some denied infant-baptism in the year 1025, 495. quoted, 534, n. 535, 539, 551, 552, 566, 648, 675. vindicates the antipædobaptists from an uncharitable opinion, 685. is said to give numerous instances of βαπτισμός signifying *immersion* only, ii. 88. cited, 18, 126, 150, 247, 397, n. Dr. Wall's handsome remarks on him, 399, 401, 404, 405, 418, 431, 459. an account of a personal interview and conference with him, 480—482, 484, 523, 654, 662.
- Stephanus, H., his Thesaurus, ii. 67, 73, 74, 86, 141, 179, 180, 192, 197, 431, 488, n. 500.
- Stephanus, Rob., ii. 109.
- Stephen, pope, i. 687. ii. 631, 632, 655.
- Stesimbrotus, an historian, ii. 183.
- Stillingfleet, bishop, i. 116, 120, 126, 129, 142. restores a passage of St. Austin, 179, 423, 424, 431, 435, 436, 446, 474, 561, 563. detects the Jesuits, 564, 660, 682. ii. 366, 370, 371, 421.
- Stoics, ii. 296.
- Stokes, Joseph, his 'Survey of Infant-Baptism,' ii. 511. his 'Compassionate Plea,' *ibid.* n. 512, 522, 523, 531, 532, 540. his description of some antipædobaptists, 553, 582, 606, 657, n.
- Storck, Nicholas, a German anabaptist, i. 513, 515.
- Stoup, M., a Dutch writer, i. 520.
- Stow, J., his History of England, ii. 506, n.
- Strabo, quoted, ii. 80, 97, 230, 235.
- Strabo, Walafrid, i. 574, 577.
- Strato, of Lampsacus, ii. 193, 194.
- Subscription to doctrines. Those churches the best, which require the fewest, i. 664.
- Suetonius, ii. 232, 568.
- Suicerus, i. 632.
- Suidas, his lexicon, i. 380, 383. ii. 73, 74, 364, 430.
- Sulpitius Severus, i. 209.
- Symmachus, the father of St. Ambrose, i. 393.
- Synod of Aix (A. D. 1585), i. 577.
- of St. Alban's, in Britain, (A. D. 429), i. 282.
- of Angiers (A. D. 1275), i. 576, 581.
- of Attiniacum, i. 476.
- of Bracar (sæc. VII.), ii. 664.
- of Carthage, i. 78, 85. ii. 634.
- of Celecyth, in Great Britain (A. D. 816), i. 578. ii. 210, 347, 458.
- of Diospolis, i. 235, 254, 256.
- of Dort, i. 231, 522.
- of Jerusalem (A. D. 410), i. 253.
- another (A. D. 418), i. 257.
- of Langres (A. D. 1404), i. 576.
- Synods, twenty-four, holden against the doctrines of Pelagius, i. 282.
- Tacitus the historian quoted, i. 19. ii. 231, 232, 513.
- Talmud, the Jewish (see Gemara), quoted, i. 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 20. ii. 209, 212. extracts, 218—222, 225, 248—250, 307, 341, 493, 509, 510, 512, 516, 524.
- Targum, of Jonathan, ii. 90, 92, 211,



236. of Jerusalem, 92. of Onkelos, 92, 236.
- Tarinus, an editor of Origen, ii. 334, 621.
- Tartars, their mode of baptism, i. 590.
- Taylor, bishop Jeremy, i. 12, 94, 221, 675. the antipædobaptists will have him to be on their side, 345. his 'Liberty of Prophesying,' *ibid.* ii. 659, 662. Dr. Hammond's judgment of it, i. 346. he explains his opinions more fully, *ibid.* his 'Dissuasive from Popery,' 354, 360, 408, 585. ii. 19, 349.
- Teaching joined in scripture with baptism, ii. 161, 162. the verb *μαθητεύω* signifies *to teach*, 162, and not '*to make disciples*,' this point discussed, 162—186.
- Tellier, Le, archbishop of Rheims, i. 285, n.
- Terence, ii. 192.
- Tertullian, i. 8. quoted, 54—64. his seeming contradictions, *ibid.* advises delay of baptism in certain cases, 60, 113, 355, 360. various reading of a passage in his treatise *de Baptismo*, 61, 345. was baptized in adult age, 77. quoted, 114, 205, 240, 270, n. 299, 311, 313, 314, 417, 423, 425, 427, 431, 432, 442, 449, 450, 451, 456, 475, 540, 542, 547, 570, 571, 592, 595—598, 602, 603, 607, 616, 627, 628, 637, 640, 643, 645, 673. ii. 53, 86, 107, 123, 124, 134, 141, 153, 156, 204, 241, 242, 254, 286, 301, 313, 322—324, 337, 345, 381, 382, 390, 392, 420, 444, 481, 516, 518, 528, 574, 577, 590, 592, 606, 610—615. various editions compared, 613, n. 632, 635, 658.
- Tertullianists, a sect, i. 54, 62.
- Texerant (probably Tisserands), i. 486.
- Theatine monks, their custom of fraudulently baptizing the Georgian and Mengrelian infants, i. 511.
- Thecla, was baptized by St. Paul, i. 408.
- Themistius, i. 137. ii. 84, 196, 229.
- Theocritus, quoted, ii. 77, 78.
- Theodectes, ii. 179.
- Theodoret, the historian, i. 124, 136, 137, 147, 242, 259, 315, 318, 321, 374, 388, 417, 418, 419, 422, 434, 623. ii. 92, 671.
- Theodorice, an anabaptist, succeeds to Menno, i. 519.
- Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, a Pelagian, i. 273, n. writes against St. Jerome, *ibid.* 295. his singular opinions, *ibid.*
- Theodorus Presbyter, maintains the works of Dionysius the Areopagite to be genuine, i. 329.
- Theodosius (father of the emperor), i. 375.
- Theodosius I., the emperor, i. 370, 372. defeats Eugenius, 373. his death. *ibid.* he was baptized, but not in infancy, 375. why? 376.
- Theodotus, bishop of Antioch, i. 257.
- Theodotus, a heretic, i. 124.
- Theophilus Antiochenus, ii. 296, 658.
- Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, i. 68. denounces Origen as a heretic, 544.
- Theophrastus, ii. 194.
- Theophylact, ii. 108.
- Theopompus, an historian, ii. 179, 193.
- Thevenot, M., i. 420. a mistake in his account of the Abyssinian Christians, 513.
- Thief, the penitent on the cross, the argument of Vincentius Victor on his case, i. 301, 302. St. Austin's answer, 302. opinions as to his being saved, 453, 454.
- Thorndyke, Dr. Herbert, his opinion on infant-baptism in ancient times, i. 355.
- Thuanus, his history, ii. 73, 106.
- Thucydides, quoted, ii. 63, 264, 283, 528, 547.
- Tliotson, archbishop, i. 659. ii. 18, 405. his remark on controversy, 656.
- Tis, ought not to be translated '*any man*' in John iii. 5, i. 448, 449.
- Toldoth, Jesu, a rabbinical book, ii. 215, 513.
- Toledo, the council of, i. 595, 600.
- Toleration Act, i. 682, ii. 56, 57, 128, 402, 409, 415, 454, 487.
- Tombes, John, his pieces against infant-baptism, i. 12, 61, 67. his opinion on some works ascribed to Origen, 68, 69. on a passage in Cyprian, 83. quoted, 316, 317. writes against Baxter, 334—339. bishop Barlow's letter to him, 348. his talents, 359. quoted, 407, 448, 475, 486, 532. is more liberal than many of his party, 535, 648, 675. wrote against separation from the church of England, 679. and continued in communion with it till his death, 680, 683. ii. 459, 466, 481, 482, 510, 539, 612, 652, 654, 658, 662.
- Towerson, Dr. Gabriel, wishes to revive dipping, i. 587.
- Translations of scripture, not sufficient to secure all persons from error, but the originals to be consulted, i. 651, 653, 655—657, 672.
- Translations of the Fathers very incorrect, ii. 322, 621.
- Transubstantiation, when it sprang up, i. 635—637.



- Trent, council of, i. 11, 175. curious anecdote of its decrees concerning original sin, 462. declares the eucharist not necessary for children, 635.
- Tribur, council of, i. 205.
- Trinity, the, ancient heresies concerning, i. 431, &c.
- Tritheism, charged unjustly on the Fathers, i. 423, 431, &c. Philoponus the first tritheist, 434.
- Trophonius, his oracle, ii. 235.
- Turks, ii. 602, 651. See *Mahometans*.
- Turretine, M., ii. 197.
- Twisk, a chronicle cited often by Danvers, i. 359, 412, 515.
- Twiss, i. 404. [qu. if not Twisk?]
- Tyndale, Wm., i. 549, 550.
- U.
- Union, recommended between our church and the antipædobaptists, i. 657, &c. difficulties in the way, 682. examples of such on both sides, 682. —687. unity recommended too by Mr. Gale, ii. 49. Dr. Wall's plan unfair, 56. another proposed, 57.
- Unitarians, in England, i. 117, 118, 120 —125. their published tenets, ib. the difficulties of their doctrine, 123. hold an opinion half Mahometan, 125. oppose the scriptures, ibid. are to be carefully watched by parochial ministers, 127.
- Ussher, archbishop, his 'history of Pelagianism,' i. 217, 219, 220, 258, 287, 298, 306, 478, 479, 483, 486, 495, 498. ii. 32, 405, 567, 568, 578.
- V.
- Valens, the emperor, an Arian, i. 136. persecutes St. Basil, ibid. 138, 369, 375. his baptism, 370. forced his subjects to become Arians, 414. his death, 618.
- Valentinian I, some account of him, i. 368. he was baptized, 370. at what period, 374. his death, 371, 375.
- Valentinian II, his birth, i. 370. is made emperor, ibid. favours the Arians, ibid. persecutes St. Ambrose, ibid. is reconciled to him, 372. is murdered, ibid. had wished to be baptized, ibid. 453. St. Ambrose's funeral oration over him, 373.
- Valentinians, i. 36, 46, 47. deny the resurrection of the body, 47. refuse to give baptism, ibid. their errors 51, 309. Irenæus' account of them, 309, 312, 336, 416, 540, 598, 605. ii. 559, 590, 591, 597, 598, 604.
- Valentinus the heretic, i. 310, 311.
- Valesius, editor of Ecclesiastical Historians, i. 137. ii. 135.
- Vanslebicus, ii. 662.
- Vasquez, Gabriel, a commentator on Thomas Aquinas, i. 61. an editor of St. Austin's works, 253, 375, 584. ii. 612.
- Vatablus, ii. 106, 442—444, 495.
- Vaucel, Louis de, writes against the book of cardinal Sfondrata, i. 285, n.
- Vaudois. See *Waldenses*.
- Velleius Paterculus, ii. 567.
- Versions of scripture quoted, for the sense of *μαθητεύω*, ii. 200, &c. 494.
- Vicecomes, Joseph, his false charge against Luther, Calvin, and Beza, i. 497—570.
- Victor, bishop of Rome, ii. 323, 609.
- Victorinus, i. 627.
- Vienna, the council of, i. 518.
- Vincentius, Bellovacensis, his 'Speculum,' i. 376. its character, 377.
- Vincentius Victor, an opponent of St. Austin, i. 26. quoted, 298. his character, and opinions, ibid. his books, 299. is the first who advised church prayers for any who had died unbaptized, 304. did not deny infant-baptism, 305. is the first (except Tertullian) who said that infants might be saved without baptism, ibid. 412, 456, 462, 470, 642. ii. 663.
- Virgil, ii. 115, 119.
- Visitation, episcopal, not sufficiently attended to, i. 560. this objected to the church of England by dissenters, 561. difficulties in the way, ibid.
- Vitalis, candidate for the see of Antioch, i. 394, 395.
- Vitellius, governor of Judæa, ii. 578.
- Vives, Ludovicus, i. 339. cited, 341, 354. some account of him, 341, n. 360, 408. ii. 19.
- Vorstius, ii. 218.
- Vossius, his work 'De Baptismo,' i. 16, 199, 450, 463, 473, 566, 591, 595. ii. 79, 86. his Pelagian history, i. 258, 287, 341. ii. 546. 'De tribus Symbolis,' i. 625. his Etymologicon, ii. 125, 141, 172, 431.
- W.
- Wake, archbishop, his translation of the Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, i. 34. ii. 274.
- Walafridus Strabo, his opinion on infant-baptism, i. 324, 339. not overlearned, ibid. his mistakes, 341, 360, 595. ii. 457. See *Strabo*.
- Waldenses, their rise, i. 480. opinions, ibid. disputes whether at first they were for or against infant-baptism, 480, 485. at present they practise it, 481. some of their books, ibid. 482, 483. their confessions, 481, 483, 505. Catechism, 482. formerly inclined to Manichean opinions, 483, 484. their numerous opponents, ibid.

- their chief seat, *ibid.* notice of some works describing them, *ibid.* n. various charges against them, 483, 485. there were several sects of them, holding different opinions, 486. whether any denied infant-baptism, 490, &c. certainly several sects of them did not deny it, 497, &c. some sectaries who preceded them held objectionable opinions, 498. whence perhaps arose the charges against the Waldenses, 499, 501. ii. 362, 661, 667.
- Waldensis, or Waldo, Petrus, founder of the Waldenses, i. 500, 501.
- Waldensis, Thomas, a Carmelite, his work on baptism, i. 305, 412.
- Walker, Wm., his *Modest Plea for Infant-baptism*, i. 12, 87, 113. an argument used by him, 362. his explanation of the text, John iii. 5, and observations on it, 446. has proved that no national church is antipædobaptist, 505, 506. his interpretation of the word *immergo*, 536, 538, 579, 581, 585, 586, 588, 590. ii. 84, 429, 431, 432, 463, 615.
- Wall, Dr., memoir of him, i. p. v, &c. quotes his *Defence*, 40, 49. jocosely speaks of his correcting the text of an ancient author, 268. his judgment of the genuineness of a disputed canon of the council of Carthage (A. D. 418), 307. protests his impartiality in citing ancient testimonies, 338. the occasion of his writing on the subject of baptism, 534. his preference of baptism by immersion, 583, &c. ii. 53, 423. he himself had dipped one infant, i. 581.
- Wall, Dr., as represented by Mr. Gale, secretly traduces the antipædobaptists, ii. 6. is very fond of Dr. Featly, *ibid.* laboured to root out the anabaptists in Kent, *ibid.* is not a formidable adversary, though the best defender of infant-baptism, 9. will be fully answered by Mr. Stennet, *ibid.* is a writer not to be depended on, *ibid.* cites Cyprian unfairly, 11. also the Apostolical Constitutions, 13. he endeavours to defame his opponents, 14. affects impartiality, *ibid.* needlessly introduces irrelevant matter, 15. as the history of the Decretal Epistles, and of Pelagius: this latter partial, *ibid.* his reproof of the Socinians, 16. he enters on controversies too deep for him, 17. reflects on Mr. Stennet, 18. slights men of high station in the church, *ibid.* is rude to the ancient Fathers, 19. also to Grotius and Le Clerc, 20. these latter two defended, 20—29. he is to be read cautiously, 29. is hollow in his show of candour, 30. is eager to relate every thing to the disadvantage of the antipædobaptists, *ibid.* prefers dipping in baptism, 54. is accused of persecution, 56. of ill-temper, 57. his dissuasive from schism censured, 37—57. his proposal for union an unfair one, 56. he is accused of disingenuity, 58. his account commended and examined, 143, &c. is guilty of prevarication, 151. his interpretation of *μαθετέω* examined and disputed, 168—207. the same defended, 429. his account of Jewish baptisms discussed, 209.
- Wall, Dr., his reasons for writing his *Defence*, ii. 359. the honour paid to his history, *ibid.*, 405. he acknowledges some blamable expressions in it: as respecting Grotius, 361. St. Chrysostom, 362. Gregory Nazianzen, *ibid.* St. Ambrose, *ibid.* was reported to have *recanted* his opinion, 363. the charge unfounded, *ibid.* he discusses Mr. Bernard's remarks on his book, 363—374. Mr. Emlyn's, 374—387. refers to his 'Critical Notes' on the New Testament, 379, and note: his compliment to Mr. Stennet, 399, 401. his kind feeling towards the antipædobaptists, 400, 479, 656. defends himself from the charge of persecution, 402, 422. of slander, 404. notices Mr. Gale's pomposity of quotations, 404, 428, 429. and his abuse of him, 404, 411, 466. his capacious complaints, 405, 411, 419, 483. his false charges, 411, 412, 419, 422, 430, 459, 466, 478, 479. has no doubt that Mr. Gale's three chapters on the subject of *dipping* were observations made, either by him or some other person, at some former period, 423, 432, 508. owns a mistake in his first edition, 425. his published supplement to his first edition, *ibid.* his opinion of sprinkling, and of such as use as *little* water as possible, 428. mentions that one chapter of Mr. Gale's book was published before the rest, by way of specimen, 430. suspects that his fifth chapter was written by some Dutch Minnists, 448. his suggestions to the clergy on the subject of sprinkling, 461—465. his 'Conference on Infant-baptism,' 469. defends himself from the charge of admitting that there is no scripture proof for infant-baptism, 466, &c. notices Mr. Gale's ill manners, 466, 483, 506, 507. his pride

- and insolence, 486, 495, 524, 553, 561, 632. the emptiness of his quotations, 488, &c. 501, 632. the unfairness of them, 521, 672, 674. maintains that his collection of testimonies is most impartial, 524. the fact acknowledged by others also, *ibid.* his remark on Mr. Gale's assertion, that 'all infants shall assuredly be saved,' 534, &c. examines at large Mr. Gale's arguments on the subject of regeneration, 582—609. he notices that 'a full answer' to his history was promised, 602, 628, 667. speaks of his intended appendix to former editions, 617, 621, 628, 635. refers to his 'Conference on Infant-baptism,' 618. his address to the antipædobaptists on the value of testimonies from the Fathers, 632—641. his motives for offering suggestions to the clergy on the subject of infant-baptism, 641, &c. wishes that the ancient method could be gradually restored, 643. his objections to the frequent use of private baptism, 644, &c. his distinction of English antipædobaptists into three classes, 649—655. his conference with Mr. Stennet on separation, 654. recapitulates Mr. Gale's unfairness towards him, 656. the reason for his replying by his 'Defence,' *ibid.* his thankfulness at being able to finish it before the approach of death, *ibid.* his review of Mr. Davye's book in answer to him, 657—667. continues his advice to the clergy, 667, &c. especially to those who intend to write on the subject of infant-baptism, 668, 672. he wishes that a picture were engraved and distributed, exhibiting Jesus Christ calling little children to him, 672.
- Walloon churches, their liturgy, *ii.* 373.
- Walton, his Polyglott Bible, *ii.* 312.
- Ware, Robt., author of 'Foxes and Firebrands,' *i.* 558, *n.* his detection of the Jesuits, 563.
- Water, the meaning attributed to it by some expositors in the text John *iii.* 5. *ii.* 668.
- Watson, bp. of Lincoln, his sermons, *i.* 580.
- Wemmers, J., his *Æthiopic Lexicon*, *ii.* 201.
- West India planters, their spiritual neglect of their slaves reprov'd, *i.* 323.
- West, Mr., *i.* 533.
- Whiston, William, *i.* 49, 325, *n. ii.* 383, 384. review of his answer to Dr. Wall's history, 387—397. his interpretation of the word *infants*, 388—390. his 'Essay on the Revelations,' 392, 638. he became a convert to antipædobaptism, 396. the immediate cause of this, 606. quoted, 586, 587, 606—608, 620, 621, 622, 629, 669.
- Whitaker, W., his opinion on sprinkling, *i.* 581.
- Whitby, Dr. Daniel, wishes to revive the use of dipping, *i.* 586. cited, *ii.* 17, 108, 110, 122, 123, 126, 133, 154, 169, 176, 196, 210, 245, 263, 267, 268, 270, 276, 328, 342, 413, 451, 489, 499, 500, 522, 531, 539, 541. some remarks on his opinions, and on his tract against Dr. Edwards, 541. his taking part in the Bangorian controversy, 542, *n.* 573, 574, 618, 659.
- White garments, newly baptized persons anciently clothed in, *i.* 210, 598.
- Whitgift, archbishop, his reply to Cartwright, *i.* 190, 470.
- Wickliffe, John, rejects the forged Decretals, *i.* 201. his opinion of infants dying unbaptized, 463, 464, 466, 517. of the proper mode of baptism, 578.
- William III. of England. Some persons declined to join in the prayers for him, *i.* 687, *ii.* 299, 563.
- Wills, Obed, rebukes Danvers, *i.* 204. his dispute with Danvers on infant-baptism, 304. notice of his tracts on the subject. *ibid.*, *n.* his appeal against Danvers, 338. accuses Danvers, 349. his 'Infant-baptism asserted,' 411, 412, 476, 477, 481, 675. *ii.* 478.
- Wotton, Dr. Wm., his *Miscellaneous Discourses*, *i.* 10. high character of them, *ii.* 509.
- Z.
- Zampi, F. M., a missionary in Georgia, *i.* 510.
- Zanchius, *i.* 472.
- Zeno, the emperor, *i.* 618.
- Zizka, John, *i.* 516.
- Zoilus, the critic, *ii.* 194.
- Zonaras, a Greek canonist, *i.* 97. his Gloss on Photius, 98, 353, *ii.* 27, 28, 408.
- Zoroaster, *ii.* 183.
- Zosimus, pope, a weak man, is persuaded to encourage Pelagius, *i.* 234, 235. deals with Cœlestius, 282—287. his inconstancy, *ibid.* his story of the emperor Constantine, 368. shewn to be false, *ibid.*



# BOOKS

PRINTED FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD:

SOLD BY

JOHN HENRY PARKER, Oxford; and 377 Strand, London, W. C. :  
and E. GARDNER, 7 Paternoster Row, London, E. C. ;

*At the following Prices in Boards.*

---

ADDISON'S Evidences of the Christian Religion. 1827. sm. 8vo.	0	2	0
ALLIX'S Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians. 1821. 8vo.	0	5	0
—— Remarks upon the History of the Churches of Piedmont. 1821. 8vo.	0	5	0
—— Remarks upon the History of the Albigenses. 1821. 8vo.	0	5	0
—— Reflections on Scripture. 1822. 8vo.	0	5	0
BENTLEY'S Sermons on Atheism. 1809. 8vo.	0	4	0
BEVERIDGE'S Discourse upon the XXXIX Articles. The third complete edition. 1847. 8vo.	0	8	0
BISCOE'S Boyle Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles. 1840. 8vo.	0	9	6
BRAGGE'S Works on the Miracles, Parables, &c. 1833. 5 vols. 8vo.	1	12	6
BULL'S Works, with Nelson's Life, by the Rev. E. BURTON, D.D. A new edition. 1846. 8 vols. 8vo.	2	9	0
BURNET'S Exposition of the XXXIX Articles. 1846. 8vo.	0	7	0
BURTON'S (Edward) Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ. Second edition. 1829. 8vo.	0	7	0
—— — to the Doctrine of the Trinity and of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. 1831. 8vo.	0	3	6
BUTLER'S Works. With an Index to the Analogy. 1849. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	11	0
—— Analogy of Religion. 1833. 12mo.	0	2	6
CHANDLER'S Critical History of the Life of David. 1853. 8vo.	0	8	6
CHILLINGWORTH'S Works. 1838. 3 vols. 8vo.	1	1	6
CLERGYMAN'S Instructor. <i>Sixth edition.</i> 1855. 8vo.	0	6	6
COMBER'S Works. 1841. 7 vols. 8vo.	1	11	6
ENCHIRIDION Theologicum Anti-Romanum.			
Vol. I. Jeremy Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, and Treatise on the Real Presence. A new edition. 1852. 8vo.	0	8	0
Vol. II. Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope; with his Dis- course on the Unity of the Church. 1852. 8vo.	0	7	6
Vol. III. Tracts selected from Wake, Patrick, Stillingfleet, Clagett, and others. 1837. 8vo.	0	11	0
FLEETWOOD'S Works. A new edition. 1854. 3 vols. 8vo.	1	1	6



*Books printed for the University of Oxford.*

GRESWELL'S <i>Harmonia Evangelica</i> . Editio quinta. 1856. 8vo.	0	9	6
— <i>Prolegomena ad Harmoniam Evangelicam</i> . 1840. 8vo.	0	9	6
— <i>Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels</i> . 1837. 5 vols. 8vo.	3	3	0
HAMMOND'S <i>Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament</i> . 1845. 4 vols. 8vo.	1	10	0
— <i>Paraphrase on the Book of Psalms</i> . Ed. T. BRANCKER. 1850. 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	0
HOOKE'S <i>Ecclesiastical Polity, and other Works; with his Life</i> by WALTON, and additions, arranged by the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A. ( <i>Reprinting</i> ).			
— (without Keble's Notes.) 1850. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	11	0
HOOPE'S (Bp.) <i>Works</i> . 1855. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	8	0
HORBERY'S <i>Works: Future Punishment, and Sermons</i> . 1828. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	8	0
JACKSON'S (Dr. Thomas) <i>Works</i> . 1844. 12 vols. 8vo.	3	6	0
JEWELL'S <i>Works</i> . A new edition, edited by the Rev. R. W. JELF, D.D. 1847. 8 vols. 8vo.	2	10	0
JONES'S <i>Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament</i> . 1827. 3 vols. 8vo.	0	15	0
LESLIE'S (C.) <i>Theological Works</i> . 1832. 7 vols. 8vo.	2	0	0
NEWCOME'S (Abp.) <i>Observations on our Lord's Conduct</i> . 1852. 8vo.	0	5	0
PARAPHRASE and Annotations on the Epistles of St. Paul. 1852. 8vo.	0	7	0
PATRICK'S (Bp.) <i>Theological Works</i> . 1859. 9 vols. 8vo.	3	14	6
PEARSON'S <i>Exposition of the Creed</i> . A new edition, revised and corrected by the Rev. E. BURTON, D.D. 1857. 8vo.	0	10	6
— <i>Minor Theological Works, now first collected, with a Memoir of the Author, Notes, and Index</i> . By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A. 1844. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	14	0
SANDERSON'S <i>Works, edited by JACOBSON</i> . 1854. 6 vols. 8vo.	1	19	0
SCOTT'S <i>Christian Life, and other Works</i> . 1826. 6 vols. 8vo.	1	7	0
SHARP'S (Abp. John) <i>Theological Works</i> . 1829. 5 vols. 8vo.	1	2	6
— (Archd. T.) <i>Charges on the Rubric and Canons</i> . 1853. 8vo.	0	3	0
SHERLOCK'S <i>Sermons, complete in 4 vols</i> . 1812. 8vo.	1	0	0
SMALRIDGE'S (Bp. G.) <i>Sermons</i> . 1852. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	8	0
SOUTH'S (Robert) <i>Sermons preached upon Several Occasions</i> . 1842. 5 vols. 8vo.	2	10	6
STANHOPE'S <i>Paraphrase and Comment on the Epistles and Gospels</i> . A new edition. 1851. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	18	0
STEELE'S <i>Christian Hero</i> . 1802. 12mo.	0	1	6
STILLINGFLEET'S <i>Origines Sacræ</i> . 1837. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	9	0
— <i>Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion: being a vindication of Abp. Laud's Relation of a Conference, &amp;c.</i> 1844. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	10	0
WATERLAND'S <i>Works, with Life, by W. VAN MILDERT, D.D.</i> late Lord Bishop of Durham. A new edition, with copious Indexes. 1857. 6 vols. 8vo.	2	11	0
— <i>Sermons on the Divinity of Jesus Christ</i> . 1815. 8vo.	0	4	6
WHEATLY'S <i>Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer</i> . A new edition. 1846. 8vo.	0	5	0

March, 1887.

## Clarendon Press, Oxford

A SELECTION OF

# BOOKS

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY

HENRY FROWDE,

AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,  
AMEN CORNER, LONDON.

ALSO TO BE HAD AT THE

CLARENDON PRESS DEPOSITORY, OXFORD.

[Every book is bound in cloth, unless otherwise described.]

---

### LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, ORIENTAL WORKS, &c.

ANGLO-SAXON.—*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, based on the MS. Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D.D., Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Oxford. Edited and enlarged by Prof. T. N. Toller, M.A. (To be completed in four parts.) Parts I and II. A—HWISTLIAN. 4to. 15s. each.

CHINESE.—*A Handbook of the Chinese Language*. By James Summers. 1863. 8vo. half bound, 1l. 8s.

— *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*, by the Chinese Monk FÁ-HIEN. Translated and annotated by James Legge, M.A., LL.D. Crown 4to. cloth back, 10s. 6d.

ENGLISH.—*A New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles*: founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by James A. H. Murray, LL.D., with the assistance of many Scholars and men of Science. Part I. A—ANT. Part II. ANT—BATTEN. Imperial 4to. 12s. 6d. each.

— *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. *Second Edition*. 1884. 4to. 2l. 4s.

— Supplement to the First Edition of the above. 4to. 2s. 6d.

— *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. *Second Edition*. 1885. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

- GREEK.—*A Greek-English Lexicon*, by Henry George Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. Seventh Edition, Revised and Augmented throughout. 1883. 4to. 1*l.* 16*s.*
- *A Greek-English Lexicon*, abridged from Liddell and Scott's 4to. edition, chiefly for the use of Schools. Twenty-first Edition. 1884. Square 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.*
- *A copious Greek-English Vocabulary*, compiled from the best authorities. 1850. 24mo. 3*s.*
- *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*, by H. W. Chandler, M.A. Second Edition. 1881. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
- HEBREW.—*The Book of Hebrew Roots*, by Abu 'l-Walîd Marwân ibn Janâh, otherwise called Rabbî Yônâh. Now first edited, with an Appendix, by Ad. Neubauer. 1875. 4to. 2*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
- *A Treatise on the use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. By S. R. Driver, D.D. Second Edition. 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*
- *Hebrew Accentuation of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job*. By William Wickes, D.D. 1881. Demy 8vo. stiff covers, 5*s.*
- ICELANDIC.—*An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, based on the MS. collections of the late Richard Cleasby. Enlarged and completed by G. Vigfússon, M.A. With an Introduction, and Life of Richard Cleasby, by G. Webbe Dasent, D.C.L. 1874. 4to. 3*l.* 7*s.*
- *A List of English Words the Etymology of which is illustrated by comparison with Icelandic*. Prepared in the form of an APPENDIX to the above. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. 1876. stitched, 2*s.*
- *An Icelandic Primer*, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary. By Henry Sweet, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
- *An Icelandic Prose Reader*, with Notes, Grammar and Glossary, by Dr. Gudbrand Vigfússon and F. York Powell, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
- LATIN.—*A Latin Dictionary*, founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary, revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D., and Charles Short, LL.D. 1879. 4to. 1*l.* 5*s.*
- MELANESIAN.—*The Melanesian Languages*. By R. H. Codrington, D.D., of the Melanesian Mission. 8vo. 18*s.*
- SANSKRIT.—*A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, arranged with reference to the Classical Languages of Europe, for the use of English Students, by Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 15*s.*
- *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Etymologically and Philologically arranged, with special reference to Greek, Latin, German, Anglo-Saxon, English, and other cognate Indo-European Languages. By Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. 1872. 4to. 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

SANSKRIT.—*Nalopākhyānam*. Story of Nala, an Episode of the Mahā-Bhārata: the Sanskrit text, with a copious Vocabulary, and an improved version of Dean Milman's Translation, by Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. Second Edition, Revised and Improved. 1879. 8vo. 15s.

— *Sakuntalā*. A Sanskrit Drama, in Seven Acts. Edited by Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. Second Edition, 1876. 8vo. 21s.

SYRIAC.—*Thesaurus Syriacus*: collegerunt Quatremère, Bernstein, Lersbach, Arnoldi, Agrell, Field, Roediger: edidit R. Payne Smith, S.T.P. Fasc. I-VI. 1868-83. sm. fol. each, 1l. 1s. Fasc. VII. 1l. 11s. 6d.  
Vol. I, containing Fasc. I-V, sm. fol. 5l. 5s.

— *The Book of Kalīlah and Dinnah*. Translated from Arabic into Syriac. Edited by W. Wright, LL.D. 1884. 8vo. 21s.

#### GREEK CLASSICS, &c.

*Aristophanes*: A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 1l. 1s.

*Aristotle*: The Politics, with Introduction, Notes, etc., by W. L. Newman, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Vols. I. and II. Nearly ready.

*Aristotle*: *The Politics*, translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 2 vols. 21s.

*Catalogus Codicum Græcorum Sinaiticorum*. Scripsit V. Gardthausen Lipsiensis. With six pages of Facsimiles. 8vo. linen, 25s.

*Heracliti Ephesii Reliquiæ*. Recensuit I. Bywater, M.A. Appendicis loco additæ sunt Diogenis Laertii Vita Heracliti, Particulæ Hippocratei De Diaeta Libri Primi, Epistolæ Heracliteæ. 1877. 8vo. 6s.

*Herculanensium Voluminum Partes II*. 1824. 8vo. 10s.

*Fragmenta Herculanensia*. A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculean Rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited by Walter Scott, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Royal 8vo. cloth, 21s.

*Homer*: A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer; to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Hymns. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 1880. 4to. 1l. 1s.

— *Scholia Græca in Iliadem*. Edited by Professor W. Dindorf, after a new collation of the Venetian MSS. by D. B. Monro, M.A., Provost of Oriel College. 4 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s. Vols. V and VI. *In the Press*.

— *Scholia Græca in Odysseam*. Edidit Guil. Dindorfus. Tomi II. 1855. 8vo. 15s. 6d.



- Plato: Apology*, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 1878. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- *Philebus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 1860. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- *Sophistes and Politicus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 1867. 8vo. 18s.
- *Theaetetus*, with a revised Text and English Notes. by L. Campbell, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- *The Dialogues*, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A. A new Edition in 5 volumes, medium 8vo. 1875. 3l. 10s.
- *The Republic*, translated into English, with an Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- Thucydides*: Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices. By B. Jowett, M.A. 2 vols. 1881. Medium 8vo. 1l. 12s.

### THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, &c.

**STUDIA BIBLICA.**—Essays in Biblical Archæology and Criticism, and kindred subjects. By Members of the University of Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**ENGLISH.**—*The Holy Bible in the earliest English Versions*, made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers: edited by the Rev. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden. 4 vols. 1850. Royal 4to. 3l. 3s.

[Also reprinted from the above, with Introduction and Glossary by W. W. Skeat, M.A.]

- *The Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon*: according to the Wycliffite Version made by Nicholas de Hereford, about A.D. 1381, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- *The New Testament in English*, according to the Version by John Wycliffe, about A.D. 1380, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.]

ENGLISH.—*The Holy Bible*: an exact reprint, page for page, of the Authorised Version published in the year 1611. Demy 4to. half bound, 1*l.* 1*s.*

— *The Psalter, or Psalms of David, and certain Canticles*, with a Translation and Exposition in English, by Richard Rolle of Hampole. Edited by H. R. Bramley, M.A., Fellow of S. M. Magdalen College, Oxford. With an Introduction and Glossary. Demy 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

— *Lectures on Ecclesiastes*. Delivered in Westminster Abbey by the Very Rev. George Granville Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

GOTHIC.—*The Gospel of St. Mark in Gothic*, according to the translation made by Wulfila in the Fourth Century. Edited with a Grammatical Introduction and Glossarial Index by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4*s.*

GREEK.—*Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum*. Accedit potior varietas Codicis Alexandrini. Tomi III. Editio Altera. 18mo. 18*s.*

— *Origenis Hexaplorum* quae supersunt; sive, Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta. Edidit Fridericus Field, A.M. 2 vols. 1875. 4to. 5*l.* 5*s.*

— *The Book of Wisdom*: the Greek Text, the Latin Vulgate, and the Authorised English Version; with an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and a Commentary. By William J. Deane, M.A. Small 4to. 12*s.* 6*d.*

— *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Antiquissimorum Codicum Textus in ordine parallelo dispositi. Accedit collatio Codicis Sinaitici. Edidit E. H. Hansell, S.T.B. Tomi III. 1864. 8vo. half morocco. Price reduced to 24*s.*

— *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Accedunt parallela S. Scripturae loca, etc. Edidit Carolus Lloyd, S.T.P.R. 18mo. 3*s.*

On writing paper, with wide margin, 10*s.*

— *Novum Testamentum Graece* juxta Exemplar Millianum. 18mo. 2*s.* 6*d.* On writing paper, with wide margin, 9*s.*

— *Evangelia Sacra Graece*. Fcap. 8vo. limp, 1*s.* 6*d.*

— *The Greek Testament*, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version:—

(1) Pica type, with Marginal References. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

(2) Long Primer type. Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

(3) The same, on writing paper, with wide margin, 15*s.*

— *The Parallel New Testament*, Greek and English; being the Authorised Version, 1611; the Revised Version, 1881; and the Greek Text followed in the Revised Version. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

*The Revised Version is the joint property of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.*

GREEK.—*Canon Muratorianus*: the earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament. Edited with Notes and a Facsimile of the MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D. 1867. 4to. 10s. 6d.

— *Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament*. By C. E. Hammond, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HEBREW, etc.—*The Psalms in Hebrew without points*. 1879. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *A Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*. Attributed to Abraham Ibn Ezra. Edited from a MS. in the Bodleian Library by S. R. Driver, M.A. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

— *The Book of Tobit*. A Chaldee Text, from a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library; with other Rabbinical Texts, English Translations, and the Itala. Edited by Ad. Neubauer, M.A. 1878. Crown 8vo. 6s.

— *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, a J. Lightfoot. A new Edition, by R. Gandell, M.A. 4 vols. 1859. 8vo. 17. 1s.

LATIN.—*Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Latina, cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica*. Edidit B. Thorpe, F.A.S. 1835. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. I.* The Gospel according to St. Matthew from the St. Germain MS. (g<sub>1</sub>). Edited with Introduction and Appendices by John Wordsworth, D.D. Small 4to., stiff covers, 6s.

— *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. II.* Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, from the Bobbio MS. (k), &c. Edited by John Wordsworth, D.D., W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., and H. J. White, M.A. Small 4to., stiff covers, 21s.

OLD-FRENCH.—*Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Gallica e Cod. MS. in Bibl. Bodleiana adservato, una cum Versione Metrica aliisque Monumentis pervetustis*. Nunc primum descripsit et edidit Franciscus Michel, Phil. Doc. 1860. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

#### FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, &c.

*St. Athanasius: Historical Writings*, according to the Benedictine Text. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *Orations against the Arians*. With an Account of his Life by William Bright, D.D. 1873. Crown 8vo. 9s.

*St. Augustine: Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, and the Acts of the Second Council of Orange. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 9s.

*Canons of the First Four General Councils* of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. 1877. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils.*  
By William Bright, D.D. 1882. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

*Cyrelli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas.* Edidit  
P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi II. 1868. 8vo. cloth, 2l. 2s.

— *in D. Joannis Evangelium.* Accedunt Fragmenta varia  
necnon Tractatus ad Tiberium Diaconum duo. Edidit post Aubertum  
P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi III. 1872. 8vo. 2l. 5s.

— *Commentarii in Lucae Evangelium* quae supersunt  
Syriace. E MSS. apud Mus. Britan. edidit R. Payne Smith, A.M. 1858.  
4to. 1l. 2s.

— Translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 2 vols. 1859.  
8vo. 14s.

*Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balaei, aliorum-  
que Opera Selecta.* E Codd. Syriacis MSS. in Museo Britannico et Bibliotheca  
Bodleiana asservatis primus edidit J. J. Overbeck. 1865. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

*Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*, according to the text of  
Burton, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo.  
8s. 6d.

*Irenaeus: The Third Book of St. Irenaeus*, Bishop of Lyons,  
against Heresies. With short Notes and a Glossary by H. Deane, B.D.  
1874. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

*Patrum Apostolicorum*, S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii,  
S. Polycarpi, quae supersunt. Edidit Guil. Jacobson, S.T.P.R. Tomi II.  
Fourth Edition, 1863. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

*Socrates' Ecclesiastical History*, according to the Text of  
Hussey, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1878. Crown 8vo.  
7s. 6d.

### ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, &c.

*Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, according to the  
uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy arranged  
in parallel columns, with preface and notes. By William Maskell, M.A.  
Third Edition. 1882. 8vo. 15s.

*Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica.* Edited, with English Notes,  
by G. H. Moberly, M.A. 1881. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.



*Bright (W.). Chapters of Early English Church History.*  
1878. 8vo. 12s.

*Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England.*  
A new Edition. Carefully revised, and the Records collated with the originals,  
by N. Pocock, M.A. 7 vols. 1865. 8vo. *Price reduced to* 1l. 10s.

*Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain*  
and Ireland. Edited, after Spelman and Wilkins, by A. W. Haddan, B.D.,  
and W. Stubbs, M.A. Vols. I. and III. 1869-71. Medium 8vo. each 1l. 1s.

Vol. II. Part I. 1873. Medium 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. Part II. 1878. Church of Ireland; Memorials of St. Patrick.  
Stiff covers, 3s. 6d.

*Hamilton (John, Archbishop of St. Andrews), The Catechism*  
*of.* Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by Thomas Graves Law. With  
a Preface by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Hammond (C. E.). Liturgies, Eastern and Western.* Edited,  
with Introduction, Notes, and Liturgical Glossary. 1878. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Appendix to the above. 1879. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 1s. 6d.

*John, Bishop of Ephesus. The Third Part of his Eccle-*  
*siastical History.* [In Syriac.] Now first edited by William Cureton, M.A.  
1853. 4to. 1l. 12s.

— Translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 1860. 8vo. 10s.

*Leofric Missal, The,* as used in the Cathedral of Exeter  
during the Episcopate of its first Bishop, A.D. 1050-1072; together with some  
Account of the Red Book of Derby, the Missal of Robert of Jumièges, and a  
few other early MS. Service Books of the English Church. Edited, with In-  
troduction and Notes, by F. E. Warren, B.D. 4to. half morocco, 35s.

*Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* The occasional  
Offices of the Church of England according to the old use of Salisbury, the  
Prymer in English, and other prayers and forms, with dissertations and notes.  
By William Maskell, M.A. Second Edition. 1882. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

*Records of the Reformation.* The Divorce, 1527-1533. Mostly  
now for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum and other libra-  
ries. Collected and arranged by N. Pocock, M.A. 1870. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

*Shirley (W. W.). Some Account of the Church in the Apostolic*  
*Age.* Second Edition, 1874. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*Stubbs (W.). Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.* An attempt  
to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. 1858. Small 4to.  
8s. 6d.

*Warren (F. E.). Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church.*  
1881. 8vo. 14s.

## ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

*Bampton Lectures*, 1886. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. By Charles Bigg, D.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Butler's Works*, with an Index to the Analogy. 2 vols. 1874. 8vo. 11s.

Also separately,

*Sermons*, 5s. 6d.

*Analogy of Religion*, 5s. 6d

*Greswell's Harmonia Evangelica*. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 1855. 9s. 6d.

*Hurtley's Harmonia Symbolica*: Creeds of the Western Church. 1858. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

*Homilies appointed to be read in Churches*. Edited by J. Griffiths, M.A. 1859. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Hooker's Works*, with his life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. Sixth Edition, 1874. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

— the text as arranged by John Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 1875. 8vo. 11s.

*Jewel's Works*. Edited by R. W. Jelf, D.D. 8 vols. 1848. 8vo. 1l. 10s.

*Pearson's Exposition of the Creed*. Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. Sixth Edition, 1877. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, with a Preface by the late Bishop of London. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— *Works*, with Life, by Bp. Van Mildert. A new Edition, with copious Indexes. 6 vols. 1856. 8vo. 2l. 11s.

*Wheatly's Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*. A new Edition, 1846. 8vo. 5s.

*Wyclif. A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif*, by W. W. Shirley, D.D. 1865. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Select English Works*. By T. Arnold, M.A. 3 vols. 1869–1871. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

— *Triologus*. With the Supplement now first edited. By Gotthard Lechler. 1869. 8vo. 7s.

## HISTORICAL AND DOCUMENTARY WORKS.

*British Barrows*, a Record of the Examination of Sepulchral Mounds in various parts of England. By William Greenwell, M.A., F.S.A. Together with Description of Figures of Skulls, General Remarks on Pre-historic Crania, and an Appendix by George Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S. 1877. Medium 8vo. 25s.

*Britton. A Treatise upon the Common Law of England*, composed by order of King Edward I. The French Text carefully revised, with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by F. M. Nichols, M.A. 2 vols. 1865. Royal 8vo. 1l. 16s.

*Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*. 7 vols. 1839. 18mo. 1l. 1s.

*Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*. Also his Life, written by himself, in which is included a Continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion. With copious Indexes. In one volume, royal 8vo. 1842. 1l. 2s.

*Clinton's Epitome of the Fasti Hellenici*. 1851. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— *Epitome of the Fasti Romani*. 1854. 8vo. 7s.

*Corpus Poeticum Boreale*. The Poetry of the Old Northern Tongue, from the Earliest Times to the Thirteenth Century. Edited, classified, and translated, with Introduction, Excursus, and Notes, by Gudbrand Vigfússon, M.A., and F. York Powell, M.A. 2 vols. 1883. 8vo. 42s.

*Freeman (E. A.). History of the Norman Conquest of England; its Causes and Results*. In Six Volumes. 8vo. 5l. 9s. 6d.

— *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First*. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

*Gascoigne's Theological Dictionary* ("Liber Veritatum"): Selected Passages, illustrating the condition of Church and State, 1403-1458. With an Introduction by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. Small 4to. 10s. 6d.

*Magna Carta*, a careful Reprint. Edited by W. Stubbs, D.D. 1879. 4to. stitched, 1s.

*Passio et Miracula Beati Olavi*. Edited from a Twelfth-Century MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, with an Introduction and Notes, by Frederick Metcalfe, M.A. Small 4to. stiff covers, 6s.

*Protests of the Lords*, including those which have been expunged, from 1624 to 1874; with Historical Introductions. Edited by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 1875. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

*Rogers (J. E. T.). History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, A.D. 1259-1793.

Vols. I and II (1259-1400). 1866. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Vols. III and IV (1401-1582). 1882. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

*Saxon Chronicles (Two of the) parallel*, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossarial Index; by J. Earle, M.A. 1865. 8vo. 16s.

*Stubbs (W., D.D.). Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History*, &c., delivered at Oxford 1867-1884. Demy 8vo. half-bound, 10s. 6d.

*Sturlunga Saga*, including the *Islendinga Saga* of Lawman Sturla Thordsson and other works. Edited by Dr. Gudbrand Vigfússon. In 2 vols. 1878. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

*York Plays*. The Plays performed by the Crafts or Mysteries of York on the day of Corpus Christi in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. Now first printed from the unique MS. in the Library of Lord Ashburnham. Edited with Introduction and Glossary by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 8vo. 21s.

*Statutes made for the University of Oxford, and for the Colleges and Halls therein*, by the University of Oxford Commissioners. 1882. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Statuta Universitatis Oxoniensis*. 1886. 8vo. 5s.

*The Examination Statutes for the Degrees of B.A., B. Mus., B.C.L., and B.M.* Revised to Hilary Term, 1887. 8vo. sewed, 1s.

*The Student's Handbook to the University and Colleges of Oxford*. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*The Oxford University Calendar for the year 1887*. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The present Edition includes all Class Lists and other University distinctions for the seven years ending with 1886.

Also, supplementary to the above, price 5s. (pp. 606),

*The Honours Register of the University of Oxford*. A complete Record of University Honours, Officers, Distinctions, and Class Lists; of the Heads of Colleges, &c., &c., from the Thirteenth Century to 1883.



## MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &amp;c.

*Acland (H. W., M.D., F.R.S.). Synopsis of the Pathological Series in the Oxford Museum.* 1867. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*De Bary (Dr. A.). Comparative Anatomy of the Vegetative Organs of the Phanerogams and Ferns.* Translated and Annotated by F. O. Bower, M.A., F.L.S., and D. H. Scott, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.S. With 241 woodcuts and an Index. Royal 8vo., half morocco, 1l. 2s. 6d.

*Goebel (Dr. K.). Outlines of Classification and Special Morphology of Plants.* A New Edition of Sachs' Text Book of Botany, Book II. English Translation by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by I. Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. With 407 Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. half Morocco, 21s.

*Lectures on the Physiology of Plants.* By Julius Sachs. Translated by H. Marshall Ward, M.A. With 445 Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. *Just ready.*

*Müller (J.). On certain Variations in the Vocal Organs of the Passeres that have hitherto escaped notice.* Translated by F. J. Bell, B.A., and edited, with an Appendix, by A. H. Garrod, M.A., F.R.S. With Plates. 1878. 4to. paper covers, 7s. 6d.

*Price (Bartholomew, M.A., F.R.S.). Treatise on Infinitesimal Calculus.*

Vol. I. Differential Calculus. Second Edition. 8vo. 14s. 6d.

Vol. II. Integral Calculus, Calculus of Variations, and Differential Equations. Second Edition, 1865. 8vo. 18s.

Vol. III. Statics, including Attractions; Dynamics of a Material Particle. Second Edition, 1868. 8vo. 16s.

Vol. IV. Dynamics of Material Systems; together with a chapter on Theoretical Dynamics, by W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S. 1862. 8vo. 16s.

*Pritchard (C., D.D., F.R.S.). Uranometria Nova Oxoniensis.* A Photometric determination of the magnitudes of all Stars visible to the naked eye, from the Pole to ten degrees south of the Equator. 1885. Royal 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— *Astronomical Observations made at the University Observatory, Oxford, under the direction of C. Pritchard, D.D.* No. 1. 1878. Royal 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

*Rigaud's Correspondence of Scientific Men of the 17th Century,* with Table of Contents by A. de Morgan, and Index by the Rev. J. Rigaud, M.A. 2 vols. 1841-1862. 8vo. 18s. 6d.

*Rolleston (George, M.D., F.R.S.). Scientific Papers and Addresses.* Arranged and Edited by William Turner, M.B., F.R.S. With a Biographical Sketch by Edward Tylor, F.R.S. With Portrait, Plates, and Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

*Westwood (J. O., M.A., F.R.S.). Thesaurus Entomologicus Hopeianus,* or a Description of the rarest Insects in the Collection given to the University by the Rev. William Hope. With 40 Plates. 1874. Small folio, half morocco, 7l. 10s.

## The Sacred Books of the East.

TRANSLATED BY VARIOUS ORIENTAL SCHOLARS, AND EDITED BY  
F. MAX MÜLLER.

[Demy 8vo. cloth.]

Vol. I. The Upanishads. Translated by F. Max Müller.  
Part I. The *Āṇḍogya-upanishad*, The *Talavakāra-upanishad*, The *Aitareya-  
āraṇyaka*, The *Kaushītaki-brāhmaṇa-upanishad*, and The *Vâgasaneyi-saṃhitā-  
upanishad*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. The Sacred Laws of the Āryas, as taught in the  
Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vâsishṭha, and Baudhāyana. Translated by  
Prof. Georg Bühler. Part I. Āpastamba and Gautama. 10s. 6d.

Vol. III. The Sacred Books of China. The Texts of Con-  
fucianism. Translated by James Legge. Part I. The *Shû King*, The Reli-  
gious portions of the *Shih King*, and The *Hsiâo King*. 12s. 6d.

Vol. IV. The Zend-Avesta. Translated by James Darme-  
steter. Part I. The *Vendîdâd*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. V. The Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West.  
Part I. The *Bundahis*, *Bahman Yast*, and *Shâyast lâ-shâyast*. 12s. 6d.

Vols. VI and IX. The *Qur'ân*. Parts I and II. Translated  
by E. H. Palmer. 21s.

Vol. VII. The Institutes of Vishnu. Translated by Julius  
Jolly. 10s. 6d.

Vol. VIII. The *Bhagavadgîtâ*, with The *Sanatsugâtiya*, and  
The *Anugîtâ*. Translated by Kâshinâth Trimbak Telang. 10s. 6d.

Vol. X. The *Dhammapada*, translated from Pâli by F. Max  
Müller; and The *Sutta-Nipâta*, translated from Pâli by V. Fausbøll; being  
Canonical Books of the Buddhists. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XI. Buddhist Suttas. Translated from Pâli by T. W.  
Rhys Davids. 1. The *Mahâparinibbâna Suttanta*; 2. The *Dhamma-kakka-  
ppavattana Sutta*; 3. The *Tevigga Suttanta*; 4. The *Akaṅkheyya Sutta*;  
5. The *Ketokhila Sutta*; 6. The *Mahâ-sudassana Suttanta*; 7. The *Sabbâsava  
Sutta*. 10s. 6d.

- Vol. XII. The Satapatha-Brâhmana, according to the Text of the Mâdhyandina School. Translated by Julius Eggeling. Part I. Books I and II. 12s. 6d.
- Vol. XIII. Vinaya Texts. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part I. The Pâtimokkha. The Mahâvagga, I-IV. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XIV. The Sacred Laws of the Âryas, as taught in the Schools of Apastamba, Gautama, Vâsishtha and Baudhâyana. Translated by Georg Bühler. Part II. Vâsishtha and Baudhâyana. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XV. The Upanishads. Translated by F. Max Müller. Part II. The Katha-upanishad, The Mundaka-upanishad, The Taittiriya-upanishad, The Brîhadâraṇyaka-upanishad, The Svetasvatara-upanishad, The Prasâna-upanishad, and The Maitrâyana-Brâhmana-upanishad. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XVI. The Sacred Books of China. The Texts of Confucianism. Translated by James Legge. Part II. The Yî King. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XVII. Vinaya Texts. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part II. The Mahâvagga, V-X. The Kullavagga, I-III. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XVIII. Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West. Part II. The Dâdîstân-î Dînîk and The Epistles of Mânûshîhar. 12s. 6d.
- Vol. XIX. The Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king. A Life of Buddha by Asvaghosha Bodhisattva, translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by Dharmaraksha, A.D. 420, and from Chinese into English by Samuel Beal. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XX. Vinaya Texts. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part III. The Kullavagga, IV-XII. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XXI. The Saddharma-puṇḍarîka; or, the Lotus of the True Law. Translated by H. Kern. 12s. 6d.
- Vol. XXII. Gaina-Sûtras. Translated from Prâkrit by Hermann Jacobi. Part I. The Âkârâṅga-Sûtra. The Kalpa-Sûtra. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XXIII. The Zend-Avesta. Translated by James Darmesteter. Part II. The Sirôzahs, Yasts, and Nyâyis. 10s. 6d.
- Vol. XXIV. Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West. Part III. Dînâ-î Maînôg-î Khirad, Sikand-gûmânîk, and Sad-Dar. 10s. 6d.

## Second Series.

Vol. XXV. Manu. Translated by Georg Bühler. 21s.

Vol. XXVI. The Satapatha-Brâhmaṇa. Translated by Julius Eggeling. Part II. 12s. 6d.

Vols. XXVII and XXVIII. The Sacred Books of China. The Texts of Confucianism. Translated by James Legge. Parts III and IV. The Lî Kî, or Collection of Treatises on the Rules of Propriety, or Ceremonial Usages. 25s.

Vols. XXIX and XXX. The Grîhya-Sûtras, Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies. Translated by Hermann Oldenberg.

Part I (Vol. XXIX), 12s. 6d. *Just Published.*

Part II (Vol. XXX). *In the Press.*

The following Volumes are in the Press:—

Vol. XXXI. The Zend-Avesta. Part III. The Yasna, Visparad, Âfrînagân, and Gâhs. Translated by the Rev. L. H. Mills. *Just ready.*

Vol. XXXII. Vedic Hymns. Translated by F. Max Müller. Part I.

Vol. XXXIII. Nârada, and some Minor Law-books. Translated by Julius Jolly. [*Preparing.*]

Vol. XXXIV. The Vedânta-Sûtras, with Saṅkara's Commentary. Translated by G. Thibaut. [*Preparing.*]

\*\*\* *The Second Series will consist of Twenty-Four Volumes.*





## Clarendon Press Series

### I. ENGLISH, &c.

- A First Reading Book.* By Marie Eichens of Berlin; and edited by Anne J. Clough. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 4d.
- Oxford Reading Book, Part I.* For Little Children. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6d.
- Oxford Reading Book, Part II.* For Junior Classes. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6d.
- An Elementary English Grammar and Exercise Book.* By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
- An English Grammar and Reading Book,* for Lower Forms in Classical Schools. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Typical Selections from the best English Writers,* with Introductory Notices. Second Edition. In 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.  
Vol. I. Latimer to Berkeley. Vol. II. Pope to Macaulay.
- Shairp (F. C., LL.D.). Aspects of Poetry;* being Lectures delivered at Oxford. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- 
- A Book for the Beginner in Anglo-Saxon.* By John Earle, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- An Anglo-Saxon Reader.* In Prose and Verse. With Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By Henry Sweet, M.A. Fourth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- A Second Anglo-Saxon Reader.* By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. *Nearly ready.*
- An Anglo-Saxon Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary.* By the same Author. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Old English Reading Primers;* edited by Henry Sweet, M.A.  
I. Selected Homilies of Ælfric. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d.  
II. Extracts from Alfred's Orosius. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d.
- First Middle English Primer, with Grammar and Glossary.* By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- Second Middle English Primer.* Extracts from Chaucer, with Grammar and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- Principles of English Etymology.* First Series. By W. W. Skeat, Litt.D. Crown 8vo. *Nearly ready.*

*The Philology of the English Tongue.* By J. Earle, M.A.  
Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*An Icelandic Primer*, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary.  
By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*An Icelandic Prose Reader*, with Notes, Grammar, and Glossary.  
By G. Vigfússon, M.A., and F. York Powell, M.A. Ext. fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*A Handbook of Phonetics*, including a Popular Exposition of  
the Principles of Spelling Reform. By H. Sweet, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Elementarbuch des Gesprochenen Englisch.* Grammatik,  
Texte und Glossar. Von Henry Sweet. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

*The Ormulum*; with the Notes and Glossary of Dr. R. M.  
White. Edited by R. Holt, M.A. 1878. 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 21s.

*Specimens of Early English.* A New and Revised Edition.  
With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By R. Morris, LL D., and  
W. W. Skeat, M.A.

Part I. From Old English Homilies to King Horn (A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1300).  
Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 9s.

Part II. From Robert of Gloucester to Gower (A.D. 1298 to A.D. 1393).  
Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Specimens of English Literature*, from the 'Ploughmans  
Crede' to the 'Shepherdes Calender' (A.D. 1394 to A.D. 1579). With Intro-  
duction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap.  
8vo. 7s. 6d.

*The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman*, in three  
Parallel Texts; together with *Richard the Redeless*. By William Langland  
(about 1362-1399 A.D.). Edited from numerous Manuscripts, with Preface,  
Notes, and a Glossary, by W. W. Skeat, Litt.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

*The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman*, by  
William Langland. Edited, with Notes, by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Third  
Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Chaucer. I. The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales*; the  
Knights Tale; The Nonne Prestes Tale. Edited by R. Morris, Editor of  
*Specimens of Early English*, &c., &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— II. *The Prioresses Tale*; *Sir Thopas*; *The Monkes  
Tale*; *The Clerkes Tale*; *The Squieres Tale*, &c. Edited by W. W. Skeat,  
M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— III. *The Tale of the Man of Lawe*; *The Pardoner's  
Tale*; *The Second Nonnes Tale*; *The Chanouns Yemannes Tale*. By the  
same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Gamelyn, The Tale of*. Edited with Notes, Glossary, &c., by  
W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

*Minot (Laurence). Poems.* Edited, with Introduction and  
Notes, by Joseph Hall, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. Nearly ready.

*Spenser's Faery Queene.* Books I and II. Designed chiefly for the use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.

*Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity, Book I.* Edited by R. W. Church, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

#### OLD ENGLISH DRAMA.

*The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with The Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus.* Three Comedies performed in St. John's College, Cambridge, A.D. MDXCVII-MDCL. Edited from MSS. by the Rev. W. D. Macray, M.A., F.S.A. Medium 8vo. Bevelled Boards, Gilt top, 8s. 6d.

*Marlowe and Greene. Marlowe's Tragical History of Dr. Faustus, and Greene's Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* Edited by A. W. Ward, M.A. *New and Enlarged Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

*Marlowe. Edward II.* With Introduction, Notes, &c. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

#### SHAKESPEARE.

*Shakespeare. Select Plays.* Edited by W. G. Clark, M.A., and W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers.

The Merchant of Venice. 1s.      Macbeth. 1s. 6d.

Richard the Second. 1s. 6d.      Hamlet. 2s.

Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A.

The Tempest. 1s. 6d.      Midsummer Night's Dream. 1s. 6d.

As You Like It. 1s. 6d.      Coriolanus. 2s. 6d.

Julius Cæsar. 2s.      Henry the Fifth. 2s.

Richard the Third. 2s. 6d.      Twelfth Night. 1s. 6d.

King Lear. 1s. 6d.      King John. 1s. 6d.

*Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist; a popular Illustration of the Principles of Scientific Criticism.* By R. G. Moulton, M.A. Crown 8vo. 5s.

*Bacon. I. Advancement of Learning.* Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— II. *The Essays.* With Introduction and Notes. By S. H. Reynolds, M.A., late Fellow of Brasenose College. *In Preparation.*

*Milton. I. Areopagitica.* With Introduction and Notes. By John W. Hales, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— II. *Poems.* Edited by R. C. Browne, M.A. 2 vols. Fifth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d. Sold separately, Vol. I. 4s.; Vol. II. 3s.

In paper covers:—

Lycidas, 3d.      L'Allegro, 3d.      Il Penseroso, 4d.      Comus, 6d.

Samson Agonistes, 6d.

— III. *Samson Agonistes.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by John Churton Collins. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 1s.

*Bunyan. I. The Pilgrim's Progress, Grace Abounding, Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan.* Edited, with Biographical Introduction and Notes, by E. Venables, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s. In ornamental Parchment, 6s.

— II. *Holy War, &c.* Edited by E. Venables, M.A. In the Press.

*Clarendon. History of the Rebellion. Book VI.* Edited by T. Arnold, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Dryden. Select Poems.* Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell; *Astræa Redux*; *Annus Mirabilis*; *Absalom and Achitophel*; *Religio Laici*; *The Hind and the Panther.* Edited by W. D. Christie, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*Locke's Conduct of the Understanding.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Addison. Selections from Papers in the Spectator.* With Notes. By T. Arnold, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. In ornamental Parchment, 6s.

*Steele. Selections from the Tatler, Spectator, and Guardian.* Edited by Austin Dobson. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. In white Parchment, 7s. 6d.

*Pope.* With Introduction and Notes. By Mark Pattison, B.D.

— I. *Essay on Man.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

— II. *Satires and Epistles.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Parnell. The Hermit.* Paper covers, 2d.

*Gray. Selected Poems.* Edited by Edmund Gosse. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d. In white Parchment, 3s.

— *Elegy and Ode on Eton College.* Paper covers, 2d.

*Goldsmith. The Deserted Village.* Paper covers, 2d.

*Johnson. I. Rasselas; Lives of Dryden and Pope.* Edited by Alfred Milnes, M.A. (London). Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d., or *Lives of Dryden and Pope* only, stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

— II. *Vanity of Human Wishes.* With Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A. Paper covers, 4d.

*Boswell's Life of Johnson. With the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides.* Edited, with copious Notes, Appendices, and Index, by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L., Pembroke College. With Portraits and Facsimiles. 6 vols. Medium 8vo. Nearly ready.

*Cowper.* Edited, with Life, Introductions, and Notes, by H. T. Griffith, B.A.

— I. *The Didactic Poems of 1782*, with Selections from the Minor Pieces, A.D. 1779–1783. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— II. *The Task, with Tirocinium*, and Selections from the Minor Poems, A.D. 1784–1799. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.



- Burke. Select Works.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A.
- I. *Thoughts on the Present Discontents; the two Speeches on America.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- II. *Reflections on the French Revolution.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.
- III. *Four Letters on the Proposals for Peace with the Regicide Directory of France.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.
- Keats. Hyperion*, Book I. With Notes by W. T. Arnold, B.A. Paper covers. 4d.
- Byron. Childe Harold.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. F. Tozer, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. In white Parchment, 5s.
- Scott. Lay of the Last Minstrel.* Edited with Preface and Notes by W. Minto, M.A. With Map. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 2s. Ornamental Parchment, 3s. 6d.
- *Lay of the Last Minstrel.* Introduction and Canto I., with Preface and Notes, by the same Editor. 6d.

## II. LATIN.

- Rudimenta Latina.* Comprising Accidence, and Exercises of a very Elementary Character, for the use of Beginners. By John Barrow Allen, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- An Elementary Latin Grammar.* By the same Author. Forty-second Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- A First Latin Exercise Book.* By the same Author. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- A Second Latin Exercise Book.* By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Reddenda Minora*, or Easy Passages, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. For the use of Lower Forms. Composed and selected by C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
- Anglice Reddenda*, or Easy Extracts, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Anglice Reddenda.* Second Series. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. *Just Published.*
- Passages for Translation into Latin.* For the use of Passmen and others. Selected by J. Y. Sargent, M.A. Fifth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

- Exercises in Latin Prose Composition*; with Introduction, Notes and Passages of Graduated Difficulty for Translation into Latin. By G. G. Ramsay, M.A., LL.D. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Hints and Helps for Latin Elegiacs.* By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- First Latin Reader.* By T. J. Nunns, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- Caesar. The Commentaries* (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By Charles E. Moberly, M.A.  
 Part I. *The Gallic War.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.  
 Part II. *The Civil War.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.  
*The Civil War.* Book I. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- Cicero. Speeches against Catilina.* By E. A. Upcott, M.A., Assistant Master in Wellington College. *In the Press.*
- Cicero. Selection of interesting and descriptive passages.* With Notes. By Henry Walford, M.A. In three Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.  
 Each Part separately, limp, 1s. 6d.  
 Part I. Anecdotes from Grecian and Roman History. Third Edition.  
 Part II. Omens and Dreams: Beauties of Nature. Third Edition.  
 Part III. Rome's Rule of her Provinces. Third Edition.
- Cicero. De Senectute.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by L. Huxley, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.  
 Or separately, Text and Introduction, 1s. Notes 1s.
- Cicero. Selected Letters* (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- Cicero. Select Orations* (for Schools). In Verrem I. De Imperio Gn. Pompeii. Pro Archia. Philippica IX. With Introduction and Notes by J. R. King, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Cornelius Nepos.* With Notes. By Oscar Browning, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- Horace. Selected Odes.* With Notes for the use of a Fifth Form. By E. C. Wickham, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.  
 Or separately, Part I. Text, 1s. Part II. Notes, 1s.
- Livy. Selections* (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In Parts, limp, each 1s. 6d.  
 Part I. The Caudine Disaster. Part II. Hannibal's Campaign in Italy. Part III. The Macedonian War.
- Livy. Books V–VII.* With Introduction and Notes. By A. R. Cluer, B.A. Second Edition. Revised by P. E. Matheson, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. (In one or two vols.) 5s.
- Livy. Books XXI, XXII, and XXIII.* With Introduction and Notes. By M. T. Tatham, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

- Ovid.* Selections for the use of Schools. With Introductions and Notes, and an Appendix on the Roman Calendar. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- Ovid. Tristia.* Book I. The Text revised, with an Introduction and Notes. By S. G. Owen, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Plautus. Captivi.* Edited by W. M. Lindsay, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. *In the Press.*
- Plautus. The Trinummus.* With Notes and Introductions. Intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools. By C. E. Freeman, M.A., and A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- Pliny. Selected Letters* (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- Sallust.* With Introduction and Notes. By W. W. Capes, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Tacitus. The Annals.* Books I–IV. Edited, with Introduction and Notes for the use of Schools and Junior Students, by H. Furneaux, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.
- Terence. Andria.* With Notes and Introductions. By C. E. Freeman, M.A., and A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- *Adelphi.* With Notes and Introductions. Intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools. By A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- Tibullus and Propertius. Selections.* Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. (In one or two vols.) 6s. *Just Published.*
- Virgil.* With Introduction and Notes. By T. L. Papillon, M.A. Two vols. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. The Text separately, 4s. 6d.
- Virgil. The Eclogues.* Edited by C. S. Jerram, M.A. In two Parts. Crown 8vo. *Nearly ready.*
- 
- Catulli Veronensis Liber.* Iterum recognovit, apparatus criticum prolegomena appendices addidit, Robinson Ellis, A.M. 1878. Demy 8vo. 16s.
- *A Commentary on Catullus.* By Robinson Ellis, M.A. 1876. Demy 8vo. 16s.
- Catulli Veronensis Carmina Selecta,* secundum recognitionem Robinson Ellis, A.M. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Cicero de Oratore.* With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, M.A.  
Book I. 1879. 8vo. 6s. Book II. 1881. 8vo. 5s.
- *Philippic Orations.* With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A. Second Edition. 1879. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

- Cicero. Select Letters.* With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 18s.
- *Select Letters.* Text. By the same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s.
- *pro Cluentio.* With Introduction and Notes. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. 2nd Ed. Ext. fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Horace.* With a Commentary. Volume I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. By Edward C. Wickham, M.A. Second Edition. 1877. Demy 8vo. 12s.
- A reprint of the above, in a size suitable for the use of Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. (May also be had in two parts.)
- Livy, Book I.* With Introduction, Historical Examination, and Notes. By J. R. Seeley, M.A. Second Edition. 1881. 8vo. 6s.
- Ovid. P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis.* Ex Novis Codicibus edidit, Scholia Vetera Commentarium cum Prolegomenis Appendice Indice addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Persius. The Satires.* With a Translation and Commentary. By John Conington, M.A. Edited by Henry Nettleship, M.A. Second Edition. 1874. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Juvenal. XIII Satires.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. H. Pearson, M.A., and Herbert A. Strong, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Latin in Liverpool University College, Victoria University. In two Parts. Crown 8vo. Complete, 6s. *Just Published.*
- Also separately,* Part I. Introduction, Text, etc., 3s. Part II. Notes, 3s. 6d.
- Tacitus. The Annals.* Books I–VI. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. Furneaux, M.A. 8vo. 18s.
- 
- Nettleship (H., M.A.). Lectures and Essays* on Subjects connected with Latin Scholarship and Literature. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- *The Roman Satura:* its original form in connection with its literary development. 8vo. sewed, 1s.
- *Ancient Lives of Vergil.* With an Essay on the Poems of Vergil, in connection with his Life and Times. 8vo. sewed, 2s.
- Papillon (T. L., M.A.). A Manual of Comparative Philology.* Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. 1882. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Pinder (North, M.A.). Selections from the less known Latin Poets.* 1869. 8vo. 15s.
- Sellar (W. Y., M.A.). Roman Poets of the Augustan Age.* VIRGIL. New Edition. 1883. Crown 8vo. 9s.
- *Roman Poets of the Republic.* New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1881. 8vo. 14s.
- Wordsworth (F., M.A.). Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin.* With Introductions and Notes. 1874. 8vo. 18s.



## III. GREEK.

*A Greek Primer*, for the use of beginners in that Language.  
By the Right Rev. Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L. Seventh Edition. Extra fcap.  
8vo. 1s. 6d.

*Easy Greek Reader*. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. In two  
Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

The Text and Notes may be had separately, 1s. 6d. each.

*Græcæ Grammaticæ Rudimenta in usum Scholarum*. Auftore Carolo Wordsworth, D.C.L. Nineteenth Edition, 1882. 12mo. 4s.

*A Greek-English Lexicon*, abridged from Liddell and Scott's 4to. edition, chiefly for the use of Schools. Twenty-first Edition. 1884. Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

*Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective*; their forms, meaning, and quantity; embracing all the Tenses used by Greek writers, with references to the passages in which they are found. By W. Veitch. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*The Elements of Greek Accentuation* (for Schools): abridged from his larger work by H. W. Chandler, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A SERIES OF GRADUATED GREEK READERS:—

*First Greek Reader*. By W. G. Rushbrooke, M.L. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Second Greek Reader*. By A. M. Bell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*Fourth Greek Reader; being Specimens of Greek Dialects*. With Introductions, etc. By W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Fifth Greek Reader*. Selections from Greek Epic and Dramatic Poetry, with Introductions and Notes. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*The Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry*: being a Collection of the finest passages in the Greek Classic Poets, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

*A Golden Treasury of Greek Prose*, being a Collection of the finest passages in the principal Greek Prose Writers, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., and J. E. L. Shadwell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound* (for Schools). With Introduction and Notes, by A. O. Prickard, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

— *Agamemnon*. With Introduction and Notes, by Arthur Sidgwick, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *Choephoroi*. With Introduction and Notes by the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

*Aristophanes.* In Single Plays. Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo.

I. The Clouds, Second Edition, 2s.

II. The Acharnians, 2s.

III. The Frogs, 2s.

*Cebes. Tabula.* With Introduction and Notes. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Demosthenes. Olynthiacs and Philippics.* Edited by Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In two Parts. *In the Press.*

*Euripides. Alcestis* (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Helena.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *Iphigenia in Tauris.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3s.

— *Medea.* By C. B. Heberden, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Or separately, Part I. Introduction and Text, 1s.

Part II. Notes and Appendices, 1s.

*Herodotus, Selections from.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Map, by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII* (for Schools). By W. W. Merry, M.A. Twenty-seventh Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Book II, separately, 1s. 6d.

— *Odyssey, Books XIII–XXIV* (for Schools). By the same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— *Iliad, Book I* (for Schools). By D. B. Monro, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

— *Iliad, Books I–XII* (for Schools). With an Introduction, a brief Homeric Grammar, and Notes. By D. B. Monro, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

— *Iliad, Books VI and XXI.* With Introduction and Notes. By Herbert Hailstone, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. each.

*Lucian. Vera Historia* (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

*Plato. Selections from the Dialogues* [including the whole of the *Apology* and *Crito*]. With Introduction and Notes by John Purves, M.A., and a Preface by the Rev. B. Jowett, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

*Sophocles*. For the use of Schools. Edited with Introductions and English Notes. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., and Evelyn Abbott, M.A. *New and Revised Edition*. 2 Vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Sold separately, Vol. I, Text, 4s. 6d.; Vol. II, Explanatory Notes, 6s.

*Sophocles*. In Single Plays, with English Notes, &c. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., and Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp.

Oedipus Tyrannus, Philoctetes. New and Revised Edition, 2s. each.

Oedipus Coloneus, Antigone, 1s. 9d. each.

Ajax, Electra, Trachiniae, 2s. each.

— *Oedipus Rex*: Dindorf's Text, with Notes by the present Bishop of St. David's. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp, 1s. 6d.

*Thucritus* (for Schools). With Notes. By H. Kynaston, D.D. (late Snow). Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Xenophon*. *Easy Selections* (for Junior Classes). With a Vocabulary, Notes, and Map. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., and C. S. Jerram, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Selections* (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Anabasis*, Book I. Edited for the use of Junior Classes and Private Students. With Introduction, Notes, etc. By J. Marshall, M.A., Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Anabasis*. Book II. With Notes and Map. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

— *Cyropaedia*, Books IV and V. With Introduction and Notes by C. Bigg, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Aristotle's Politics*. By W. L. Newman, M.A. [*In the Press*.]

*Aristotelian Studies*. I. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. C. Wilson, M.A. 8vo. stiff, 5s.

*Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*, ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Crown 8vo. 5s.

*Demosthenes and Aeschines*. The Orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown. With Introductory Essays and Notes. By G. A. Simcox, M.A., and W. H. Simcox, M.A. 1872. 8vo. 12s.

*Head (Barclay V.)*. *Historia Numorum: A Manual of Greek Numismatics*. Royal 8vo. half-bound. 2l. 2s. *Just Published*.

*Hicks (E. L., M.A.)*. *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Homer. Odyssey*, Books I–XII. Edited with English Notes, Appendices, etc. By W. W. Merry, M.A., and the late James Riddell, M.A. 1886. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 16s.

*Homer. A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect.* By D. B. Monro, M.A. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Sophocles.* The Plays and Fragments. With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A. 2 vols.

Vol. I. *Oedipus Tyrannus. Oedipus Coloneus. Antigone.* 8vo. 16s.

Vol. II. *Ajax. Electra. Trachiniae. Philoctetes. Fragments.* 8vo. 16s.

#### IV. FRENCH AND ITALIAN.

*Brachet's Etymological Dictionary of the French Language*, with a Preface on the Principles of French Etymology. Translated into English by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— *Historical Grammar of the French Language.* Translated into English by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Works by GEORGE SAINTSBURY, M.A.

*Primer of French Literature.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Short History of French Literature.* Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Specimens of French Literature, from Villon to Hugo.* Crown 8vo. 9s.

#### MASTERPIECES OF THE FRENCH DRAMA.

*Corneille's Horace.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Andrew Lang, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

*Racine's Esther.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Beaumarchais' Le Barbier de Séville.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Austin Dobson. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Voltaire's Mérope.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.

*Musset's On ne badine pas avec l'Amour, and Fantasio.* Edited, with Prolegomena, Notes, etc., by Walter Herries Pollock. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

The above six Plays may be had in ornamental case, and bound in Imitation Parchment, price 12s. 6d.



*Sainte-Beuve. Selections from the Causeries du Lundi.* Edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Quinct's Lettres à sa Mère.* Selected and edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Gautier, Théophile. Scenes of Travel.* Selected and Edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*L'Éloquence de la Chaire et de la Tribune Françaises.* Edited by Paul Blouët, B.A. (Univ. Gallic.). Vol. I. French Sacred Oratory. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Edited by GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A.

*Cornaille's Cinna.* With Notes, Glossary, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

*Louis XIV and his Contemporaries;* as described in Extracts from the best Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century. With English Notes, Genealogical Tables, &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Maistre, Xavier de. Voyage autour de ma Chambre.* Ourika, by *Madame de Duras*; *Le Vieux Tailleur*, by *MM. Erckmann-Chatrian*; *La Veillée de Vincennes*, by *Alfred de Vigny*; *Les Jumeaux de l'Hôtel Corneille*, by *Edmond About*; *Mésaventures d'un Écolier*, by *Rodolphe Töpffer*. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin, and Racine's Athalie.* With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin.* With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

*Molière's Les Femmes Savantes.* With Notes, Glossary, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

*Racine's Andromaque, and Cornaille's Le Menteur.* With Louis Racine's Life of his Father. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Regnard's Le Foueur, and Brucys and Palaprat's Le Grondeur.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Sévigné, Madame de, and her chief Contemporaries, Selections from the Correspondence of.* Intended more especially for Girls' Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

*Dante. Selections from the Inferno.* With Introduction and Notes. By H. B. Cotterill, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Tasso. La Gerusalemme Liberata.* Cantos i, ii. With Introduction and Notes. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

## V. GERMAN.

*Scherer (W.). A History of German Literature.* Translated from the Third German Edition by Mrs. F. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

*Max Müller.* The German Classics, from the Fourth to the Nineteenth Century. With Biographical Notices, Translations into Modern German, and Notes. By F. Max Müller, M.A. A New Edition, Revised, Enlarged, and Adapted to Wilhelm Scherer's 'History of German Literature,' by F. Lichtenstein. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

## GERMAN COURSE. By HERMANN LANGE.

*The Germans at Home;* a Practical Introduction to German Conversation, with an Appendix containing the Essentials of German Grammar. Second Edition. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*The German Manual;* a German Grammar, Reading Book, and a Handbook of German Conversation. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Grammar of the German Language.* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*German Composition;* A Theoretical and Practical Guide to the Art of Translating English Prose into German. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Lessing's Laokoon.* With Introduction, English Notes, etc. By A. Hamann, Phil. Doc., M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Schiller's Wilhelm Tell.* Translated into English Verse by E. Massie, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Also, Edited by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Phil. Doc.

*Becker's Friedrich der Grosse.* Extra fcap. 8vo. *In the Press.*

*Goethe's Egmont.* With a Life of Goethe, &c. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *Iphigenie auf Tauris.* A Drama. With a Critical Introduction and Notes. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

*Heine's Prosa,* being Selections from his Prose Works. With English Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Heine's Harzreise.* With Life of Heine, Descriptive Sketch of the Harz, and Index. Extra fcap. 8vo. paper covers, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s. 6d.

*Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm.* A Comedy. With a Life of Lessing, Critical Analysis, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Nathan der Weise.* With Introduction, Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Schiller's Historische Skizzen; Egmont's Leben und Tod*, and *Belagerung von Antwerpen*. With a Map. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Wilhelm Tell*. With a Life of Schiller; an historical and critical Introduction, Arguments, and a complete Commentary, and Map. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Wilhelm Tell*. School Edition. With Map. 2s.

*Modern German Reader*. A Graduated Collection of Extracts in Prose and Poetry from Modern German writers:—

Part I. With English Notes, a Grammatical Appendix, and a complete Vocabulary. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Part II. With English Notes and an Index. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Niebuhr's Griechische Heroen-Geschichten*. Tales of Greek Heroes. Edited with English Notes and a Vocabulary, by Emma S. Buchheim. School Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. *Stiff covers*, 1s. 6d.

## VI. MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

By LEWIS HENSLEY, M.A.

*Figures made Easy*: a first Arithmetic Book. Crown 8vo. 6d.

*Answers to the Examples in Figures made Easy*, together with two thousand additional Examples, with Answers. Crown 8vo. 1s.

*The Scholar's Arithmetic*: with Answers. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*The Scholar's Algebra*. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Aldis (W. S., M.A.)*. *A Text-Book of Algebra*. Crown 8vo. *Nearly ready*.

*Baynes (R. E., M.A.)*. *Lessons on Thermodynamics*. 1878. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Chambers (G. F., F.R.A.S.)*. *A Handbook of Descriptive Astronomy*. Third Edition. 1877. Demy 8vo. 28s.

*Clarke (Col. A. R., C.B., R.E.)*. *Geodesy*. 1880. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Cremona (Luigi)*. *Elements of Projective Geometry*. Translated by C. Leudesdorf, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Donkin*. *Acoustics*. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Euclid Revised*. Containing the Essentials of the Elements of Plane Geometry as given by Euclid in his first Six Books. Edited by R. C. J. Nixon, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Sold separately as follows,

Books I–IV. 3s. 6d. Books I, II. 1s. 6d.

Book I. 1s.

Galton (Douglas, C.B., F.R.S.). *The Construction of Healthy Dwellings*. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hamilton (Sir R. G. C.), and J. Ball. *Book-keeping*. New and enlarged Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp cloth, 2s.

Ruled Exercise books adapted to the above may be had, price 2s.

Harcourt (A. G. Vernon, M.A.), and H. G. Madan, M.A. *Exercises in Practical Chemistry*. Vol. I. Elementary Exercises. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Maclaren (Archibald). *A System of Physical Education: Theoretical and Practical*. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Madan (H. G., M.A.). *Tables of Qualitative Analysis*. Large 4to. paper, 4s. 6d.

Maxwell (J. Clerk, M.A., F.R.S.). *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*. Second Edition. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

— *An Elementary Treatise on Electricity*. Edited by William Garnett, M.A. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Minchin (G. M., M.A.). *A Treatise on Statics with Applications to Physics*. Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. Vol. I. *Equilibrium of Coplanar Forces*. 8vo. 9s. Vol. II. *Statics*. 8vo. 16s.

— *Uniplanar Kinematics of Solids and Fluids*. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Phillips (John, M.A., F.R.S.). *Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames*. 1871. 8vo. 21s.

— *Vesuvius*. 1869. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Prestwich (Joseph, M.A., F.R.S.). *Geology, Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical*. Vol. I. Chemical and Physical. Royal 8vo. 25s.

Roach (T., M.A.). *Elementary Trigonometry*. Crown 8vo. Nearly ready.

Rolleston's *Forms of Animal Life*. Illustrated by Descriptions and Drawings of Dissections. New Edition. (Nearly ready.)

Smyth. *A Cycle of Celestial Objects*. Observed, Reduced, and Discussed by Admiral W. H. Smyth, R.N. Revised, condensed, and greatly enlarged by G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. 1881. 8vo. Price reduced to 12s.

Stewart (Balfour, LL.D., F.R.S.). *A Treatise on Heat*, with numerous Woodcuts and Diagrams. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.



*Vernon-Harcourt (L. F., M.A.). A Treatise on Rivers and Canals*, relating to the Control and Improvement of Rivers, and the Design, Construction, and Development of Canals. 2 vols. (Vol. I, Text. Vol. II, Plates.) 8vo. 21s.

— *Harbours and Docks*; their Physical Features, History, Construction, Equipment, and Maintenance; with Statistics as to their Commercial Development. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

*Watson (H. W., M.A.). A Treatise on the Kinetic Theory of Gases.* 1876. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*Watson (H. W., D. Sc., F.R.S.), and S. H. Burbury, M.A.*

I. *A Treatise on the Application of Generalised Coordinates to the Kinetics of a Material System.* 1879. 8vo. 6s.

II. *The Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism.* Vol. I. Electrostatics. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Williamson (A. W., Phil. Doc., F.R.S.). Chemistry for Students.* A new Edition, with Solutions. 1873. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

## VII. HISTORY.

*Bluntschli (J. K.). The Theory of the State.* By J. K. Bluntschli, late Professor of Political Sciences in the University of Heidelberg. Authorised English Translation from the Sixth German Edition. Demy 8vo. half bound, 12s. 6d.

*Finlay (George, LL.D.). A History of Greece* from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 3l. 10s.

*Fortescue (Sir John, Kt.). The Governance of England*: otherwise called *The Difference between an Absolute and a Limited Monarchy.* A Revised Text. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by Charles Plummer, M.A. 8vo. half bound, 12s. 6d.

*Freeman (E. A., D.C.L.). A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*George (H. B., M.A.). Genealogical Tables illustrative of Modern History.* Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Small 4to. 12s.

*Hodgkin (T.). Italy and her Invaders.* Illustrated with Plates and Maps. Vols. I—IV., A.D. 376–553. 8vo. 3l. 8s.

*Kitchin (G. W., D.D.). A History of France.* With numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables. In Three Volumes. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. each 10s. 6d.

Vol. 1. Down to the Year 1453.

Vol. 2. From 1453–1624.

Vol. 3. From 1624–1793.

- Payne (E. F., M.A.). A History of the United States of America.* In the Press.
- Ranke (L. von). A History of England.* principally in the Seventeenth Century. Translated by Resident Members of the University of Oxford, under the superintendence of G. W. Kitchin, D.D., and C. W. Boase, M.A. 1875. 6 vols. 8vo. 3l. 3s.
- Rawlinson (George, M.A.). A Manual of Ancient History.* Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 14s.
- Rogers (J. E. Thorold, M.A.). The First Nine Years of the Bank of England.* 8vo. cloth. Just ready.
- Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History,* from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward I. Arranged and edited by W. Stubbs, D.D. Fifth Edition. 1883. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- Stubbs (W., D.D.). The Constitutional History of England,* in its Origin and Development. Library Edition. 3 vols. demy 8vo. 2l. 8s.  
Also in 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 12s. each.
- *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History, &c.,* delivered at Oxford 1867-1884. Demy 8vo. half-bound, 10s. 6d.
- Wellesley. A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers of the Marquess Wellesley, K.G.,* during his Government of India. Edited by S. J. Owen, M.A. 1877. 8vo. 1l. 4s.
- Wellington. A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers relating to India of Field-Marshal the Duke of Wellington, K.G.* Edited by S. J. Owen, M.A. 1880. 8vo. 24s.
- A History of British India.* By S. J. Owen, M.A., Reader in Indian History in the University of Oxford. In preparation.

## VIII. LAW.

- Alberici Gentilis, I.C.D., I.C., De Iure Belli Libri Tres.* Edidit T. E. Holland, I.C.D. 1877. Small 4to. half morocco, 21s.
- Anson (Sir William R., Bart., D.C.L.). Principles of the English Law of Contract, and of Agency in its Relation to Contract.* Fourth Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- *Law and Custom of the Constitution.* Part I. Parliament. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Bentham (Jeremy). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.* Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- Digby (Kenelm E., M.A.). An Introduction to the History of the Law of Real Property.* Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius.* With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. Second Edition. 1875. 8vo. 18s.

*Hall (W. E., M.A.). International Law.* Second Ed. 8vo. 21s.

*Holland (T. E., D.C.L.). The Elements of Jurisprudence.*  
Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *The European Concert in the Eastern Question*, a Collection of Treaties and other Public Acts. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Imperatoris Iustiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor*; with Introductions, Commentary, Excursus and Translation. By J. E. Moyle, B.C.L., M.A. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 21s.

*Justinian, The Institutes of*, edited as a recension of the Institutes of Gaius, by Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L. Second Edition, 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

*Justinian, Select Titles from the Digest of.* By T. E. Holland, D.C.L., and C. L. Shadwell, B.C.L. 8vo. 14s.

Also sold in Parts, in paper covers, as follows:—

Part I. Introductory Titles. 2s. 6d. Part II. Family Law. 1s.

Part III. Property Law. 2s. 6d. Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 1). 3s. 6d.

Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 2). 4s. 6d.

*Lex Aquilia.* The Roman Law of Damage to Property: being a Commentary on the Title of the Digest 'Ad Legem Aquiliam' (ix. 2). With an Introduction to the Study of the Corpus Iuris Civilis. By Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Markby (W., D.C.L.). Elements of Law* considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Twiss (Sir Travers, D.C.L.). The Law of Nations* considered as Independent Political Communities.

Part I. On the Rights and Duties of Nations in time of Peace. A new Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1884. Demy 8vo. 15s.

Part II. On the Rights and Duties of Nations in Time of War. Second Edition Revised. 1875. Demy 8vo. 21s.

## IX. MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY, &c.

*Bacon's Novum Organum.* Edited, with English Notes, by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. 1855. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

— Translated by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. 1855. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

*Berkeley. The Works of George Berkeley, D.D.*, formerly Bishop of Cloyne; including many of his writings hitherto unpublished. With Prefaces, Annotations, and an Account of his Life and Philosophy, by Alexander Campbell Fraser, M.A. 4 vols. 1871. 8vo. 2l. 18s.

*The Life, Letters, &c.* 1 vol. 16s.

— *Selections from.* With an Introduction and Notes. For the use of Students in the Universities. By Alexander Campbell Fraser, LL.D. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Fowler (T., D.D.). The Elements of Deductive Logic*, designed mainly for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. Eighth Edition, with a Collection of Examples. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *The Elements of Inductive Logic*, designed mainly for the use of Students in the Universities. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

— and Wilson (F. M., B.D.). *The Principles of Morals* (Introductory Chapters). 8vo. boards, 3s. 6d.

— *The Principles of Morals*. Part II. (Being the Body of the Work.) 8vo. 10s. 6d. *Just Published*.

Edited by T. FOWLER, D.D.

*Bacon. Novum Organum*. With Introduction, Notes, &c. 1878. 8vo. 14s.

*Locke's Conduct of the Understanding*. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Danson (F. T.). The Wealth of Households*. Crown 8vo. 5s.

*Green (T. H., M.A.). Prolegomena to Ethics*. Edited by A. C. Bradley, M.A. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.

*Hegel. The Logic of Hegel*; translated from the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Prolegomena by William Wallace, M.A. 1874. 8vo. 14s.

*Lotze's Logic*, in Three Books; of Thought, of Investigation, and of Knowledge. English Translation; Edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.

— *Metaphysic*, in Three Books; Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology. English Translation; Edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.

*Martineau (James, D.D.). Types of Ethical Theory*. Second Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15s.

*Rogers (F. E. Thorold, M.A.). A Manual of Political Economy*, for the use of Schools. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Smith's Wealth of Nations*. A new Edition, with Notes, by J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 1880. 21s.

## X. ART, &c.

*Head (Barclay V.). Historia Numorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics*. Royal 8vo. half morocco, 42s.

*Hullah (John). The Cultivation of the Speaking Voice*. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Ouseley (Sir F. A. Gore, Bart.). A Treatise on Harmony*. Third Edition. 4to. 10s.

— *A Treatise on Counterpoint, Canon, and Fugue*, based upon that of Cherubini. Second Edition. 4to. 16s.

— *A Treatise on Musical Form and General Composition*. Second Edition. 4to. 10s.



- Robinson (J. C., F.S.A.). A Critical Account of the Drawings by Michel Angelo and Raffaello in the University Galleries, Oxford. 1870. Crown 8vo. 4s.*
- Ruskin (John, M.A.). A Course of Lectures on Art, delivered before the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1870. 8vo. 6s.*
- Troutbeck (J., M.A.) and R. F. Dale, M.A. A Music Primer (for Schools). Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
- Tyrawhitt (R. St. J., M.A.). A Handbook of Pictorial Art. With coloured Illustrations, Photographs, and a chapter on Perspective by A. Macdonald. Second Edition. 1872. 8vo. half morocco, 18s.*
- Upcott (L. E., M.A.). An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*
- Vaux (W. S. W., M.A.). Catalogue of the Castellani Collection of Antiquities in the University Galleries, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 1s.*
- 

*The Oxford Bible for Teachers*, containing supplementary HELPS TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE, including Summaries of the several Books, with copious Explanatory Notes and Tables illustrative of Scripture History and the characteristics of Bible Lands; with a complete Index of Subjects, a Concordance, a Dictionary of Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Prices in various sizes and bindings from 3s. to 2l. 5s.

---


*Helps to the Study of the Bible*, taken from the OXFORD BIBLE FOR TEACHERS, comprising Summaries of the several Books, with copious Explanatory Notes and Tables illustrative of Scripture History and the Characteristics of Bible Lands; with a complete Index of Subjects, a Concordance, a Dictionary of Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.; 16mo. cloth, 1s.

---

—+—

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE,  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER,  
OXFORD: CLARENDON PRESS DEPOSITORY,  
116 HIGH STREET.

---

 *The DELEGATES OF THE PRESS invite suggestions and advice from all persons interested in education; and will be thankful for hints, &c. addressed to the SECRETARY TO THE DELEGATES, Clarendon Press, Oxford.*





5577

W  
RTheol Wall, William

The history of infant baptism. Vol. II.

University of Toronto  
Library

---

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

---





